Diocese of Aberdeen
and Orkney.

WITHDRAWN
FROM STOCK

CHRISTIE MEMORIAL
LIBRARY.

D.2.2

No. 3024
17.

THE EARLY EUCHARIST

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

[*All rights reserved.*]

THE EARLY EUCHARIST

(A.D. 30—180)

BY

W. B. FRANKLAND, M.A.,

FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE,
AND LATE MATHEMATICAL LECTURER AT SELWYN, CAMBRIDGE:
LONDON UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR

Tout JÉSUS n'est-il pas dans les paroles du Dernier Souper?

PAUL SABATIER.

LONDON:
C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.
1902

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

TO MY MOTHER.

Λάβετε ἄμπελον· πρῶτον μὲν φυλλοροεῖ,
εἶτα βλαστὸς γίνεται, εἶτα φύλλον,
εἶτα ἄνθος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὄμφαξ,
εἶτα σταφυλὴ παρεστηκυῖα.

PREFACE

THE present Essay is an expansion and revision of that which was awarded the Hulsean Prize for 1900. The prescribed subject was: The Eucharist in the First Two Centuries, but no writer later than Irenaeus is used, and this has led to the change of title.

My plan has been to collect the significant passages which were to be found in writers earlier than Irenaeus, as well as in Irenaeus himself. They are first analysed, and then combined to illustrate aspects of the Eucharist. The analysis has been revised before publication, and the synthesis added.

The authorities are reproduced with translations, and attention has been strictly confined to them. The earliest citations are from the Gospels and S. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians; the latest are taken from Justin Martyr's Apologies and Irenaeus' work against Heresies. The beginning is thus made in Canonical Scripture; the end is reached in apologetic works addressed to the Pagan, the Jew and the Christian.

The critical controversy associated with the names of Harnack, Zahn, Jülicher, Spitta and Gardner has been passed over. For various reasons I have not attempted to master it; the works of Hoffmann (Die Abendmahlsgedanken JESU Christi, 1896) and Schäfer (Das Herrenmahl, 1897) sum up the controversy, which has at least served to direct attention to the fountain-head of Eucharistic doctrine and practice.

It will be observed that the Agape receives scanty consideration. The word itself occurs no more than three times, so far as I know, in the writings of which use has been made; and in none of these places is its connection with the Eucharist clear, nor its implication obvious. If I could regard it as requiring fuller treatment within the period considered, Dr Keating's compendious work: The Agapé and the Eucharist, would well supply the need.

In this examination of the Primitive Eucharist, my main desire has been to present the principal evidences in a convenient form; and their analysis and synthesis are to be regarded, not as the development of a position, so much as the result of my own efforts to discover what the evidence implies. I have endeavoured to avoid mention of matters of doubt and opinion, and have declined polemics except in respect of the very bases of Christian Doctrine and Sacramental Truth. The introduction contains a note of the groundwork of belief on which I have built; I have been unable to abandon these fundamental and vital Truths for the purpose of that specious openness and fairness which is unreasonably demanded by those who are not sure whether they accept the Incarnation and its direct consequences. Had I consciously been unfaithful to this supreme Truth, my Essay would have been thrown into the fire.

To pass from great to small matters, the ritual controversies of the end of the last century have not been introduced, but I believe there is much that would help some, who have of late spoken much and loudly, in the writings of this earliest century and a half of the Church's History.

The composition and revision of my Essay have been a long and slow process, and I am sensible, therefore, of many obligations and gratitudes which are difficult to express as fully as I would wish. Above all, I desire to mention Dr Swete's Lectures on the Eucharist in the Early Church, which it was my happy privilege to attend in the Lent Term, 1899; and my gratitude to Dr Swete is increased by the frequent advice and help

and encouragement which he was never too busy to give me; to the Rev. J. H. Srawley and the Rev. W. L. E. Parsons I am indebted for discussions of particular passages in the early Fathers; and in the two new Bible Dictionaries I have found articles of great usefulness,—in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, the articles on "JESUS Christ," "Lord's Supper," "Communion," "Chronology," by Drs Sanday and Plummer, Canon Robinson and Mr Turner respectively, and in the Encyclopaedia Biblica, the article on "Eucharist" by Canon Robinson. Hoffmann's work already mentioned has been of assistance; and the reading of Dr Gardner's "Exploratio Evangelica" was stimulating but unconvincing throughout.

In conclusion, I desire to express my warmest gratitude to my friend, the Rev. C. E. Garrad, who, amid the pressure of parochial work, has given to the proofs of these pages a scrutiny at once so critical and sympathetic that I could wish there had fallen to him a share in the production of the work rather than in its elaboration.

W. B. FRANKLAND.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE:
Ascension Tide, 1902.

NOTE:

The Textual Materials have been derived as follows:

New Testament:	Westcott and Hort; London, 1895.
Sub-Apostolic Writings:	Lightfoot and Harmer; London, 1893.
Justin Martyr:	Otto; Jena, 1842.
Irenaeus:	Harvey; Cambridge, 1857.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I. TEXTUAL MATERIALS.

New Testament 3
Sub-Apostolic Writings 12
Justin and Irenaeus 19

PART II. ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE.

The Institution of the Eucharist 30
The Preparation for the Eucharist 47
The Eucharist in the Pauline Churches 50
The Eucharist in the Sub-Apostolic Writings 57
The Eucharist in Justin Martyr 71
The Eucharist in Irenaeus 77

PART III. SYNTHESIS OF EVIDENCE.

The Celebration of the Eucharist 83
The Discipline of the Eucharist 92
The Eucharist as a Spiritual Meal 95
The Eucharist as a Communion 97
The Eucharist as a Service of Thanksgiving 99
The Eucharist as a Memorial Service 102
The Eucharist as the Christian Sacrifice 105
The Economy of the Eucharistic Mystery 111

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

A. On the Lucan Account of the Last Supper 116
B. On Dr Gardner's "Origin of the Lord's Supper" 120
C. On Mr Wright's View of S. John vi. 124
D. On the Agape 126
E. On the Eucharistic Sections of the Didache 127

INDEX 129

DEUS, QUI NOBIS SUB SACRAMENTO MIRABILI PASSIONIS TUAE MEMORIAM RELIQUISTI, TRIBUE, QUAESUMUS, ITA NOS CORPORIS ET SANGUINIS TUI SACRA MYSTERIA VENERARI, UT REDEMPTIONIS TUAE FRUCTUM IN NOBIS JUGITER SENTIAMUS.

INTRODUCTION

HISTORICAL SCIENCE is radically different from the Natural Sciences in that it has to deal with purposive units. Physics, Chemistry, Biology are concerned with the coordination of things and appearances, the what and the how. History must needs have a wider scope; the tabulation of fact is essential, the what and the how must be known; but this is not the end; the why cannot be excluded. History deals with men as men of thought and purpose, and it is incomplete until the thought and purpose of those who make history are interpreted by those who write it.

Thus the mechanical view of the world, so desirable and necessary in Natural Science, fails lamentably when it is applied to History. Man is not a complex of molecules only, or a bundle of tissue only; he is the product of evolution, but also the forger of the future; the physical, chemical, biological man is a mere formula or mechanism, not the "Being breathing thoughtful breath, A Traveller between life and death" of History. If man is indeed a spiritual being, he is affected by spiritual impulses and spiritual forces which are not seldom alien or hostile to his material environment; and History largely records the triumph of the individual over the multitude, of the organism over the environment.

The dreary hypothesis which the physiological historian adopts at the cost of ignoring his own destiny in the eternal counsels of God, that man is complex organic matter and no more, reduces the field of History to a mathematical problem; it rejects all the self-sacrifice of love and aspiration, and strives to analyse in terms of carbon and hydrogen and oxygen and nitrogen, along with a little phosphorus and iron and what not, all the heroism of the saint, the patriot and the lover; in its bases it is unsound, and in its results ridiculous.

The true and higher view of History is far from being the easier road. Into the Historian's estimates of motives and causes, his personal equation inevitably intrudes, and from this individual bias there is no entire escape.

It becomes necessary, therefore, not only to the success but to the intelligibility of an historical survey, that the writer's attitude be first expressed with reference to the principles which govern or guide his interpretation of evidence.

If this be the case in General History, the need is still more imperative in the domain of Doctrinal History. For any but a barren result, premisses or postulates must be laid down, to be faithfully followed in the examination of facts. The writer's labour is then not altogether lost even if his preliminary postulates are not accepted, because his standpoint is thus clearly expressed and understood. These postulates may be regarded as a provisional hypothesis, or, as in the present case, they may be such that their rejection would render the entire investigation all but nugatory. It would in fact be useless and absurd to discuss and explain the language of men saturated with belief in the Incarnation without at least assuming the truth of their view of that Event; on any other hypothesis than its truth, the result is a study in morbid psychology.

The evidence, examined in the light of the Postulates, leads to Conclusions: Postulates and Conclusions combine to form an Hypothesis, which may then be tested, first, by its consistency with itself, and again, by its agreement with the facts adduced.

To proceed from these general considerations to the special needs of the present Essay, three Postulates are laid down, by the aid of which the Essay has come to be more than a catena of quotations; they are necessary to secure coherence and abolish caprice.

First, it is postulated that the most real and forcible factors in life are spiritual; secondly, that the founder of the Christian Church was both God and Man; thirdly, that the Holy Spirit continues Christ's teaching of the Father's will.

Without these postulates or their equivalents, the history of the Eucharist is the narration of a gigantic mistake or a terrible fraud, along with the history of Catholic Christianity. The belief expressed in the last postulate begets the reasonable hope that out of what might otherwise appear but scattered fragments and accidental allusions a mosaic of truth may be constructed. The very idea of truth postulates help and guidance from God: "Truth at the last is the word or speech of God."

PART I

TEXTUAL MATERIALS

I

THE NEW TESTAMENT

i. The Feeding of the Five Thousand

Mc 6^{41-42} (cf Mt 14^{19-20}, Lc 9^{16-17})

And He took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looked up to heaven, and blessed and broke the loaves, and gave (them) to the Disciples to set before them; and the two fishes He divided among all. And they all ate and were satisfied.

Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν. καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν.

Jn $6^{11-12, 23, 32-35, 47-51, 53-56}$

Then JESUS took the loaves, and gave thanks and distributed to them that reclined, and similarly of the fish as much as they would. When they were satisfied He says to His Disciples: "Gather together the pieces left over, that nothing be lost."...

Boats came from Tiberias near the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks....

Then JESUS said to them: "Indeed, indeed, I tell you, Moses did not give you the bread from heaven, but My Father gives

Ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον. ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ **Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα, ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται**....

ἦλθεν πλοῖα ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου....

εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ **Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ Μωυσῆς ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν**

ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν· ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ. εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν Κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε....

you the bread from heaven, the true (bread); for the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world." They said therefore to Him: "Lord, always give us this bread." JESUS said to them: "I am the bread of life; he who comes to Me shall not hunger, and he who believes on Me shall never thirst."...

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς· οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸ μάννα καὶ ἀπέθανον· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς....

"Indeed, indeed, I tell you, he who believes has life everlasting. I am the bread of life; your fathers ate the manna in the desert, and died; this is the bread which comes down from heaven that any one may eat of it and not die. I am the bread, the living (bread), which came down from heaven; if any one eat of this bread he shall live for ever, and moreover the bread which I shall give is My Flesh on behalf of the life of the world."...

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθής ἐστι βρῶσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθής ἐστι πόσις. ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ.

"Indeed, indeed, I tell you, unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, you have not life in yourselves. He who eats My Flesh and drinks My Blood has life everlasting, and I will raise him at the last day; for My Flesh is true meat, and My Blood is true drink. He who eats My Flesh and drinks My Blood abides in Me and I in him."

ii. The Feeding of the Four Thousand

Mc $8^{6-8,9}$ (cf. Mt 15^{36-37})

Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ. καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι. καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν....

And He took the seven loaves, and gave thanks, and broke, and gave to His Disciples to set before the people, and they set before them. And they had a few small fishes; and He blessed them, and bade them set these also before them. And they ate and were satisfied....

καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς.

And He dismissed them.

iii. The Institution of the Eucharist

As they were eating JESUS took a loaf, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to His Disciples, saying: "Take, eat; this is My Body." And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying: "Drink of it, all of you; for this is My Blood of the Covenant, which is poured forth for many unto remission of sins; and I tell you, I will not drink henceforward of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it with you new in the Kingdom of My Father." And they recited a psalm and went out to the Mount of Olives.

Mt 26^{26-30}

Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν ΛΑΒΕΤΕ ΦΑΓΕΤΕ, ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ΠΙΕΤΕ ἐΞ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ, ΤΟΥΤΟ ΓΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΕΚΧΥΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ· **λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου.** Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.

Mc $14^{12, 17-18, 22-26}$

And on the first day of the unleavened (bread), when they killed the Passover, His Disciples say to Him: "Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayst eat the Passover?"...

And at evening He comes with the Twelve. And as they were reclining and eating JESUS said: "Indeed, I tell you that one of you will betray Me, he that is eating with Me."...

And as they were eating He took a loaf and blessed and broke and gave to them and said: "Take, this is My Body." And He took a cup and gave thanks, and gave to them, and they all drank of it. And He said to them: "This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is poured forth on behalf of many. Indeed, I tell you that I will not drink any longer of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God." And they recited a psalm and went out to the Mount of Olives.

Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ **Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα;...**

Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ εἶπεν **Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ....**

Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν ΛΑΒΕΤΕ, ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ ΤΟ ΕΚΧΥΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ ΥΠΕΡ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ· **ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.** Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.

Lc $22^{7, 14-21}$

Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα....

Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς **Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.** καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν **Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.** καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ϹΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ [[ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΟΝ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗϹΙΝ. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ ΜΟΥ, ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΚΧΥΝΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ]]. **πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.**

Then came the day of the unleavened (bread), on which the Passover must be killed....

And when the hour came, He reclined, and the Apostles with Him. And He said to them: "With longing I have longed to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you that I will not eat it until it has been consummated in the Kingdom of God." And He received a cup, and gave thanks, and said: "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you, I will not drink from now of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God has come." And He took a loaf, and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying: "This is My Body, [which is given on your behalf; this do for My memorial." And the cup similarly after the meal, saying: "This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood, which is poured forth on your behalf.]—But see, the hand of My betrayer is with Me upon the table."

1 Co 11^{23-25}

Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ϹΩΜΑ ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗϹΙΝ. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΕΜΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ, ΟϹΑΚΙϹ ΕΑΝ ΠΙΝΗΤΕ, ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗϹΙΝ.

For I received from the Lord, what I also imparted to you, that the Lord JESUS, in the night on which He was being betrayed, took a loaf, and gave thanks, and broke it, and said: "This is My Body, which is on your behalf; this do for My memorial." Similarly also the cup, after the meal, saying: "This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood; this do, as often as you drink it, for My memorial."

iv. Meals after the Resurrection

Lc $24^{30-31, 35}$

And it happened, while He was reclining with them, that He took the loaf, and blessed it and broke it and distributed to them; and their eyes were opened and they recognized Him....

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπεδίδου αὐτοῖς· αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν....

And they related the events of the way, and how He became known to them in the breaking of the bread.

καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.

Jn 21^{13}

JESUS comes and takes the loaf and gives to them, and the fish similarly.

Ἔρχεται ΙΗΣΟΥΣ καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὀψάριον ὁμοίως.

v. The Breaking of Bread after Pentecost

Ac $2^{41-42, 46-47}$

Thereupon they who received his word were baptized, and there were added in that day souls about three thousand. And they were continuing in the teaching of the Apostles and the fellowship, the breaking of the bread and the prayers...and day by day both continuing with one accord in the Temple and breaking bread at home, they were partaking of food in gladness and simplicity of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people.

Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ προσετέθησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλιαι. ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. ... καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας, αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαόν.

Ac $20^{7-8, 11}$

On the first day of the week, when we had assembled to break bread, Paul was discoursing to them, intending to leave next day, and prolonged his discourse until midnight. There were a great number of lamps in the upper room where we had assembled.... And he ascended and broke the bread and ate and conversed a long while, until dawn, and so departed.

Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς, μέλλων ἐξιέναι τῇ ἐπαύριον, παρέτεινέν τε τὸν λόγον μέχρι μεσονυκτίου. ἦσαν δὲ λαμπάδες ἱκαναὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπερῴῳ οὗ ἦμεν συνηγμένοι.... ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὁμιλήσας ἄχρι αὐγῆς οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν.

Ac 27^{35-36}

Εἴπας δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησεν τῷ θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων καὶ κλάσας ἤρξατο ἐσθίειν. εὔθυμοι δὲ γενόμενοι πάντες καὶ αὐτοὶ προσελάβοντο τροφῆς.

Saying this, (Paul) took a loaf, and gave thanks to God in presence of all, and broke it and began to eat. Then all became cheerful, and themselves partook of food.

vi. The Agape

Ju[12]

Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι.

These are they who are reefs in your love-feasts, as they feast with you.

2 Pe 2^{13}

Σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (ἀγάπαις) αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν.

Spots and blemishes, faring delicately in their deceits (love-feasts), as they feast with you.

vii. Pauline Teaching on the Eucharist

1 Co 5^{11-13}

Νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ᾖ πόρνος ἢ πλεονέκτης ἢ εἰδωλολάτρης ἢ λοίδορος ἢ μέθυσος ἢ ἅρπαξ, τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν. τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν; οὐχὶ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε, τοὺς δὲ ἔξω ὁ θεὸς κρίνει; ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν.

Now I have written to you not to associate, if any one called a brother be a fornicator or covetous or an idolater or a reviler or a drunkard or an extortioner, with such a man not even to eat. For what have I to do with judging those without? Do not you judge those within, and does not God judge those without? Cast out the evil man from among yourselves.

1 Co $10^{1-4, 6, 14-24}$

Οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆλθον, καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα, ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ χριστός....

For I would not have you ignorant, brothers, that our fathers all were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all received baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink, for they were drinking from a spiritual rock which followed, and the rock was Christ....

These things happened for types of ourselves....

Wherefore, my loved ones, flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men; do you judge what I say. The cup of the blessing, which we bless, is it not fellowship of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not fellowship of the Body of Christ? Because one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread. Look at Israel after the flesh; are not they who eat the sacrifices in fellowship with the altar? What then do I say? That what is sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? But (I do say) that what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God, and I would not have you in fellowship with devils. You cannot drink a Lord's cup and a devils' cup; you cannot share a Lord's table and a devils' table. Or, dare we provoke the Lord? Are we stronger than He?—Everything is permissible, but everything is not expedient. Everything is permissible, but everything does not benefit. Let none seek his own but other's advantage.

Ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν....

Διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας. ὡς φρονίμοις λέγω· κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὃ φημι. Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐστίν; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἓν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα· οὐχ οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσίν; τὶ οὖν φημί; ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν, ἢ ὅτι εἴδωλόν τί ἐστιν; ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν τὰ ἔθνη, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ θύουσιν, οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι. οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων· οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων. ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον; μὴ ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἐσμέν; Πάντα ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. πάντα ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα οἰκοδομεῖ. μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητείτω ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου.

1 Co 11[20–34]

When, therefore, you assemble together, it is not to eat a Lord's Supper, for each hurries forward with his own supper during the meal, and one is hungry while another is drunken. Surely you have homes for eating and drinking? Or do you despise the Church of God, and put the poor to shame? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you? In this matter I do not. For I received from the Lord, what I also imparted to you, that the Lord JESUS, in the night on which He was being betrayed, took a loaf, and gave thanks, and broke it, and said: "This is My Body, which is on your behalf; this do for My memorial." Similarly also the

Συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν, ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν, καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ μεθύει. μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν; ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε, καὶ καταισχύνετε τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας; τί εἴπω ὑμῖν; ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς; ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ. ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ΕCΤΙΝ ΤΟ CΩΜΑ ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙC ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗCΙΝ. *ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων* ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΕCΤΙΝ

ἐΝ τῷ ἐΜῷ αἵΜΑΤΙ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ, ὁΣΑΚΙΣ ἐΑΝ
ΠΊΝΗΤΕ, ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ἐΜΗΝ ἈΝΆΜΝΗΣΙΝ. *ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ. ὥστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου. δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω· ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοι καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί. εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα· κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε. εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε. Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὡς ἂν ἔλθω διατάξομαι.*

cup after the meal, saying: "This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood; this do, as often as you drink it, for My memorial." For as often as you eat this bread, and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until He come. So that whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily, will be guilty of the Body and of the Blood of the Lord. Let a man, then, test himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup; for he who eats and drinks, eats and drinks judgment for himself, if he do not discern the Body. For this cause among you are many weakly and ailing and a great number sleep. If we discerned ourselves, we should not be judged; but when we are judged by the Lord we are disciplined so that we be not condemned with the world. So, my brothers, when you come together for the meal wait for one another. If any one is hungry, let him eat at home, so that you may not come together unto judgment. The other matters I will arrange when I have come.

1 Co 14^{16-19}

Ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῇς ἐν πνεύματι, ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ Ἀμήν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ; ἐπειδὴ τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδεν· σὺ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ ἕτερος οὐκ οἰκοδομεῖται. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶ· ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοΐ μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, ἢ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ.

When you offer blessing in spirit, how can he who fills the place of the layman say Amen to your thanksgiving? For he does not know what you say; you indeed give thanks well, but the other is not benefited. I thank God, I talk in tongues more than all of you; but in Church I would rather talk five words with my understanding, so that I instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue.

Eph 5^{18-21}

Καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία, ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς,

And be not drunken with wine, in which is profligacy, but be replete in spirit, talking to yourselves with psalms and hymns and

spiritual songs, singing and chanting with your heart to the Lord, giving thanks always on every behalf in the name of our Lord JESUS Christ to the God, who is also Father, subjecting yourselves to one another in fear of Christ.

ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ.

Col 4^{2-3}

Continue in prayer, being vigilant therein with thanksgiving, and praying at the same time also for us.

Τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν.

viii. The Christian Sacrifice

He 13^{8-16}

JESUS Christ is yesterday and today the same, and unto the ages. Do not be carried astray by various strange doctrines; for it is good for the heart to be confirmed by grace, not by meats, in which those who concerned themselves were not benefited. We have an altar, from which those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is carried for sin into the Holy Place by the High-priest, are burnt up outside the camp; wherefore also JESUS, that He might sanctify the people by His own Blood, suffered outside the gate. And so let us come out to Him outside the camp, bearing His disgrace, for we have not here a lasting city, but we look for the coming City; through Him let us offer up sacrifice of praise continually to God, that is, fruit of lips making confession to His Name. And do not neglect well-doing and fellowship, for with such sacrifices God is well-pleased.

ΙΗΣΟΥΣ Χριστὸς ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε· καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατοῦντες. ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες. ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζῴων τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαίεται ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς· διὸ καὶ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθεν. τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες, οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν· δι' αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διὰ παντὸς τῷ θεῷ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός.

ix. The Consummation of the Eucharist

Apoc 21^{22}

And I saw not a temple in the CITY, for the Lord, the GOD, the Almighty, is Its Temple, and the LAMB.

Καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν Αὐτῇ, ὁ γὰρ Κύριος, ὁ Θεός, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ, Ναὸς Αὐτῆς ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ Ἀρνίον.

II

SUB-APOSTOLIC WRITINGS

i. S. Clement of Rome, Epistle to the Corinthians

§ 34[6–8]

Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· **Μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ, καὶ χίλιαι χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐκέκραγον·** "Αγιος, "Αγιος, "Αγιος Κύριος Σαβαώθ, πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. *Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες τῇ συνειδήσει, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενῶς εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ. λέγει γάρ·* **Ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν.**

For the Scripture says: "Myriads of myriads were standing beside Him, and thousands of thousands were serving Him; and they were crying out: 'Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Sabaoth; all creation is full of His glory.'" Let us then also, assembled together in harmony with purpose of heart, cry as from one mouth to Him, earnestly praying to become partakers of His great and glorious promises. For He says: "Eye has not seen, and ear has not heard, and it has not entered into man's heart, what He has prepared for them that await Him."

§ 40

Προδήλων οὖν ἡμῖν ὄντων τούτων, καὶ ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως, πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν ὅσα ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους· τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιμελῶς ἐπιτελεῖσθαι καὶ οὐκ εἰκῇ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὡρισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις· ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὥρισεν τῇ ὑπερτάτῳ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει· ἵν' ὁσίως πάντα γινόμενα ἐν εὐδοκήσει εὐπρόσδεκτα εἴη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. Οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι, τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ

Since these things are already clear to us, and we have looked into the depths of the Divine knowledge, we ought to do everything in order, whatever the Master commanded us to perform at ordered times; both the offerings and services He commanded to be performed with care and not in heedless or disorderly manner, but at definite seasons and hours; and where and by whom He will have them performed, He Himself defined by His supreme purpose; so that everything being done piously and approvedly might be acceptable to His will.

Therefore those who make their offerings at the prescribed seasons are both acceptable and blessed, for in following the regulations of the Master they do not fall into error. For to the High-priest his own services have been given, and to the Priests their own place has been ordained, and upon the Levites have been laid their own ministrations; the Layman has been bound by the lay ordinances.

δεσπότου ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν. τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἴδιαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσίν, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευῖταις ἴδιαι διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται.

§ 41

Each of you, Brothers, in his own order, give thanks to God, maintaining a good conscience, not departing from the defined rule of his service, in reverence. Not everywhere, Brothers, are offered continual sacrifices, or of prayers, or for sin and trespass, but in Jerusalem only; and there, moreover, not in every place is offering made, but before the sanctuary towards the altar, and the offering is inspected for blemish by the High-priest and the aforesaid Ministers. Therefore, those who do anything contrary to the disposition of His will, have death for the penalty. See, Brothers, the greater the knowledge vouchsafed to us, the greater by so much is the danger incurred.

Ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαριστείτω Θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὡρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. Οὐ πανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμοῦ ἢ εὐχῶν ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ πλημμελείας, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· κἀκεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν. οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῆς βουλήσεως αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντές τι θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν. Ὁρᾶτε, ἀδελφοί, ὅσῳ πλείονος κατηξιώθημεν γνώσεως, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὑποκείμεθα κινδύνῳ.

§ 64

For the rest, may the all-beholding God and Master of spirits, and Lord of all flesh, who chose out the Lord JESUS Christ, and us through Him, to be a peculiar people, give to every soul called by His excellent and holy Name faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, temperance, chastity, and wisdom, unto acceptance to His Name through our High-priest and Protector JESUS Christ; through whom to Him be glory and majesty, power, honour, both now and unto all ages of ages. Amen.

Λοιπὸν ὁ παντεπόπτης Θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ Κύριος πάσης σαρκός, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον ΙΗΣΟΥΝ Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον, δῴη πάσῃ ψυχῇ ἐπικεκλημένῃ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πίστιν, φόβον, εἰρήνην, ὑπομονήν, μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἁγνείαν καὶ σωφροσύνην, εἰς εὐαρέστησιν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ· δι' οὗ αὐτῷ δόξα καὶ μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, τιμή, καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

ii. S. Ignatius' Epistles

Eph 5^2, 13^1, 20

a. Μηδεὶς πλανάσθω· ἐὰν μή τις ᾖ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Let no one err; if any be not within the altar-shrine, he lacks the bread of God.

b. Σπουδάζετε οὖν πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν.

Make it your business then to assemble more frequently for thanksgiving to God and for praise.

c. Ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅ ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός.

Breaking one bread, which is medicine of immortality, an antidote to secure that we do not die but live in JESUS Christ continually.

Trall 7^2, 8^1

d. Ὁ ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὢν καθαρός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἐκτὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὢν οὐ καθαρός ἐστιν· τουτέστιν, ὁ χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτερίου καὶ διακόνων πράσσων τι, οὗτος οὐ καθαρός ἐστιν τῇ συνειδήσει.

He who is within altar-shrine is pure, but he who is without altar-shrine is not pure; that is, he who acts apart from Bishop and Presbytery and Deacons, this man is not pure in his conscience.

e. Ὑμεῖς οὖν τὴν πραϋπάθειαν ἀναλαβόντες ἀνακτήσασθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πίστει, ὅ ἐστιν σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ὅ ἐστιν αἷμα ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ.

Do you therefore take up meekness and revive yourselves in faith, which is Flesh of the Lord, and in love, which is Blood of JESUS Christ.

Rom 7^3

f. Οὐχ ἥδομαι τροφῇ φθορᾶς οὐδὲ ἡδοναῖς τοῦ βίου τούτου· ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ὅ ἐστιν σὰρξ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δανείδ, καὶ πόμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος.

I do not take pleasure in food of corruption or pleasures of this life; I wish for God's bread, which is Flesh of Christ, who is of David's seed, and for drink I wish for His Blood, which is love incorruptible.

Philad 4

g. Σπουδάσατε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ·

Make it your business then to use one Eucharist; for there is one Flesh of our Lord JESUS Christ, and one cup unto union of His

Blood; one altar-shrine, as there is one Bishop, together with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow-slaves; so that, whereinsoever you act, you may act according to God.

ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις τοῖς συνδούλοις μου· ἵνα, ὃ ἐὰν πράσσητε, κατὰ Θεὸν πράσσητε.

Smyrn 6^2, $8^{1,2}$

They absent themselves from thanksgiving and prayer because they do not confess the Eucharist to be Flesh of our Saviour JESUS Christ, which suffered on behalf of our sins, and which of His goodness the Father raised.

h. Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν.

Let no one act apart from Bishop in any of the concerns of the Church. Let that be esteemed a valid Eucharist which is under the Bishop, or him to whom he may have entrusted it....

k. Μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ....

It is not permissible apart from the Bishop either to baptise or to make a love-feast; but whatever he approves, that is acceptable also to God, so that everything in which you act may be secure and valid.

οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν· ἀλλ' ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Θεῷ εὐάρεστον, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσετε.

iii. A Letter from Pliny the Younger to Trajan (Ep 96)

They were wont on a fixed day to assemble before daylight and sing antiphonally a hymn to Christ as to a god, and to bind themselves by an oath, not to some crime, but against theft and robbery and adultery and breaking faith and repudiating a pledge on demand; and when this was over their custom was to depart, and meet together again to take food, but ordinary and harmless; and this indeed they ceased to do after my edict wherein in accordance with your orders I had forbidden clubs.

Soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium; quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram.

iv. Letter of the Smyrnaeans on the Martyrdom of Polycarp

Ep Smyrn 14[2, 3]

(Ὁ δὲ προσδεθείς...εἶπεν·)

Εὐλογῶ σε, ὅτι κατηξίωσάς με τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ὥρας ταύτης, τοῦ λαβεῖν με μέρος ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν μαρτύρων ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου....

διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων σε αἰνῶ, σὲ εὐλογῶ, σὲ δοξάζω διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου καὶ ἐπουρανίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός, δι' οὗ σοι σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

(And Polycarp being bound said:)

"I bless Thee that Thou hast vouchsafed me this day and hour, to take my part in the number of the martyrs in the cup of Thy Christ unto resurrection of everlasting life of both soul and body in incorruption of the Holy Spirit....

For this cause, and for everything, I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, through the eternal and heavenly High-priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Servant, through whom to Thee with Him and the Holy Spirit be the glory both now and always and for the ages to come. Amen."

v. The Epitaph of Avircius

Ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολείτης τοῦτ' ἐποίησα
ζῶν, ἵν' ἔχω φανερῶς σώματος ἔνθα θέσιν.
οὔνομ' Ἀουίρκιος ὤν, ὁ μαθητὴς ποιμένος ἁγνοῦ
ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας ὄρεσιν πεδίοις τε,
ὀφθαλμοὺς ὃς ἔχει μεγάλους καὶ πάνθ' ὁρώντας.
οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε λόγους καὶ γράμματα πιστά,
εἰς Ῥώμην ὃς ἔπεμψεν ἐμὲν βασιλῆαν ἀθρῆσαι
καὶ βασίλισσαν ἰδεῖν, χρυσόστολον, χρυσοπέδιλον·
λαὸν δ' εἶδον ἐκεῖ λαμπρὰν σφραγεῖδαν ἔχοντα.
καὶ Συρίης πέδον εἶδα καὶ ἄστεα πάντα, Νίσιβιν [τ',]
Εὐφράτην διαβάς· πάντη δ' ἔσχον συνομήθεις.
Παῦλον ἔχων ἑπόμην, Πίστις πάντη δὲ προῆγε,
καὶ παρέθηκε τροφὴν πάντη, ἰχθὺν ἀπὸ πηγῆς,
πανμεγεθῆ, καθαρόν, ὃν ἐδράξατο παρθένος ἁγνή,
καὶ τοῦτον ἐπέδωκε φίλοις ἔσθειν διὰ παντός,
οἶνον χρηστὸν ἔχουσα, κέρασμα διδοῦσα μετ' ἄρτου.

The citizen of an elect City, I made this in my lifetime, so as plainly to have there a resting-place for my body. My name is Avircius, the disciple of a pure Shepherd who tends flocks of sheep on hills and plains, and who has eyes great and all-seeing. He taught me words and trustworthy letters, and sent me to Rome to behold a King and to see a Queen in golden raiment, in golden shoes; and I saw there a People having a bright Seal. Also I saw Syria's plain, and all its towns, and Nisibis when I crossed Euphrates; and everywhere I had comrades. With Paul I followed, and Faith everywhere led the way, and everywhere set Food before me, Fish from fountain, mighty, pure, which a chaste Virgin laid hold of, and this bestowed on friends to eat continually, with excellent Wine, giving mingled Wine with Bread.

vi. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Didache)

§ 9

For the Eucharist, give thanks thus: first, for the cup: "We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast manifested to us through JESUS Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory unto the ages." For the broken (bread): "We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge, which Thou hast manifested to us through JESUS Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory unto the ages. As this broken (bread) was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the bounds of the earth into Thy Kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through JESUS Christ unto the ages." Let no one eat or drink from your Eucharist but those baptised into the Lord's name. For of this the Lord said: "Do not give the holy thing to the dogs."

Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτω εὐχαριστήσατε· πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου· **Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ 'ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.** *περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος·* **Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ 'ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἕν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις διὰ 'ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.** *μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου. καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἴρηκεν ὁ Κύριος·* **Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί.**

§ 10

And after you are satisfied give thanks thus: "We thank Thee, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name, which Thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou hast manifested to us through JESUS Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory unto the ages. Thou, Almighty Master, hast created all things for Thy Name's sake, and hast given food and drink to mankind for refreshment, so that they may give thanks to Thee, but to us hast vouchsafed spiritual food and drink and life eternal through Thy Servant. Above all we thank Thee that Thou art powerful; to Thee be the glory unto the ages. Remember, Lord, Thy Church to rescue it from

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· **Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ 'ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου. πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ σύ· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέ-**

μων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν, ἣν ἡτοίμασας αὐτῇ· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαυείδ. εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω. μαρὰν ἀθά. ἀμήν. *τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.*

all evil, and to perfect it in Thy love, and do Thou gather it together from the four winds, sanctified unto Thy Kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory unto the ages. Let grace come, and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any is holy, let him come; if any is not, let him repent. Maran atha. Amen." But permit the prophets to give thanks as they wish.

§ 14

Κατὰ *κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ᾖ. πᾶς δὲ ἔχων τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ μὴ συνελθέτω ὑμῖν, ἕως οὗ διαλλαγῶσιν, ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν. αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κυρίου· Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαράν· ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμί, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.*

On the Lord's own day, assemble together and break bread and give thanks, having confessed your transgressions, so that your sacrifice may be pure. Everyone who is at variance with his neighbour, let him not join your company, until they be reconciled, so that your sacrifice may not be defiled. For this is the saying of the Lord: "In every place and time offer Me pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and My Name is wonderful among the nations."

III

JUSTIN MARTYR AND SAINT IRENÆUS

i. Justin Martyr

1 Apol 13

That we are not atheists, therefore, we who worship the Maker of all this world, who say, as we were taught, that He does not need blood-offerings and libations and incense, who praise Him by word of prayer and thanksgiving for all that we eat, to the best of our power, who have received that this honour is alone worthy of Him, that we do not waste with fire the things made by Him for our sustenance, but offer them for ourselves and the needy, and that being thankful to Him we send up in speech solemn prayers and hymns for our creation and for all means of strength, for qualities of races and changes of seasons, and who send up petitions that our incorruptibility be restored because of our faith in Him,—what reasonable man will not agree?

And JESUS Christ, who has become our teacher in these matters and who for this was born, and crucified under Pontius Pilate, the governor in Judaea in the times of Tiberius Caesar,—He, we have learned, is indeed Son of the very God, and Him we esteem in second place; and thirdly the Prophetic Spirit; and that with reason we honour them, we will prove.

Ἄθεοι μὲν οὖν ὡς οὐκ ἐσμεν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι, ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, λέγοντες, λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν, ὅση δύναμις, αἰνοῦντες, μόνην ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην παραλαβόντες, τὸ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς διατροφὴν γενόμενα οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾶν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὑμνοὺς πέμπειν ὑπέρ τε τοῦ γεγονέναι καὶ τῶν εἰς εὐρωστίαν πόρων πάντων, ποιοτήτων μὲν γενῶν καὶ μεταβολῶν ὡρῶν, καὶ τοῦ πάλιν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ γενέσθαι διὰ πίστιν τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτήσεις πέμποντες,—τίς σωφρονῶν οὐχ ὁμολογήσει;

Τὸν διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων γενόμενον ἡμῖν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο γεννηθέντα ΙΗΣΟΥΝ Χριστόν, τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χρόνοις Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπου, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως θεοῦ μάθοντες καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν.

1 Apol 65—67

Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον καὶ συγκατατεθειμένον ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσί, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων εὐτόνως, ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὑρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων· Ἀμήν. τὸ δὲ ἀμὴν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ τὸ γένοιτο σημαίνει. εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

We, then, after this washing of him who has professed his persuasion, lead him to the Brothers as they are called, at their place of meeting, to make common prayers heartily both for ourselves and the Enlightened one and all others everywhere, that it may be vouchsafed us, who have learned the truth, to be found in deeds good citizens and guardians of the ordinances, so that we may be saved with the everlasting salvation. We salute one another with a kiss when we have ceased from the prayers. Then is brought to the President of the Brothers a loaf and a cup of water and tempered wine, and he, taking it, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and makes thanksgiving for a good while for His vouchsafing these things; and when he has completed the prayers and the thanksgiving all the people present approve by saying 'Amen,' which word in the Hebrew language signifies: 'May it be.' And when the President has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their approval, those whom we style 'Deacons' give to each of those present to partake of the consecrated bread and wine and water, and they convey them to those not present.

καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς ΙΗΣΟΥΣ Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν

And this food is with us called 'Eucharist,' and it is allowed to none other to share in it but to him who believes what we teach to be true and who has received the washing for remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who is living as Christ delivered to us. For we do not take these as ordinary bread and ordinary drink, but, as by word of God JESUS Christ our Saviour became incarnate, and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also the food made Eucharist by prayer of word from Him,—food by which

our blood and flesh are by a change nourished,—is both Flesh and Blood, we have been taught, of that incarnate JESUS. For the Apostles, in the records made by them called 'Gospels,' delivered that it was enjoined upon them thus, that JESUS took a loaf and gave thanks and said: "This do for My memorial; this is My Body"; and took the cup similarly and gave thanks and said: "This is My Blood,"—and imparted to them only. This also in the mysteries of Mithras the evil devils delivered to be done in imitation; for, that bread and a cup of water are set in the initiatory rites of the neophyte, with certain formulae, you either are aware or can learn.

Now we ever afterwards remind one another always of these things; and those of us who have, succour those who lack; and we continue attached to one another. And for all that we eat we bless the Maker of all things through His Son, JESUS Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. And on the day called Sunday an assemblage is made of all who live in town or country into one place, and the records of the Apostles or the scriptures of the Prophets are read as long as there is opportunity. Then when the reader has ceased, the President speaks and makes admonition and exhortation to the imitation of these excellent things. Then we rise all together, and send up prayers. And, as we said before, when we have ceased from prayer, bread is brought and wine and water, and the President sends up prayers similarly and thanksgivings, to the best of his power, and the people approve by saying 'Amen'; and the distribution and participation of the consecrated things is then made to each, and they are sent by the Deacons' hands to those not present. Those who are well off and willing, each according to his own purpose, give what they will; and

τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος 510
ΙΗΣΟΥ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· **τὸν ΙΗΣΟΥΝ λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν·** Τοῦτο 515
ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙC ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗCΙΝ ΜΟΥ, ΤΟΥΤΕCΤΙ ΤΟ CΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ· **καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν·** Τοῦτό ΕCΤΙΝ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ, **καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι.** *ὅπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις* 520
παρέδωκαν γίνεσθαι μιμησάμενοι οἱ πονηροὶ δαίμονες· ὅτι γὰρ ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος τίθεται ἐν ταῖς τοῦ μυουμένου τελεταῖς μετ' ἐπιλόγων τινῶν, ἢ ἐπίστασθε ἢ μαθεῖν δύνασθε.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τούτων 525
ἀλλήλους ἀναμμνήσκομεν· καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες τοῖς λειπομένοις πᾶσιν ἐπικουροῦμεν, καὶ σύνεσμεν ἀλλήλοις ἀεί. ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ πνεύματος τοῦ 530
ἁγίου. καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. εἶτα παυσαμένου 535
τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν. καὶ, ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς ἄρτος προσφέρεται 540
καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ 545
τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὃ βούλεται δίδωσι, καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ τοῖς διὰ 550
νόσον ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς

ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἁπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ *Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη· τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν κρονικήν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.*

the sum collected is deposited with the President, and he succours both orphans and widows, and those in want from illness or other reason, and those in prison, and aliens resident among us; in a word, he is a guardian to all in need. It is on Sunday that we all make the common assemblage, because it is the first day, on which God made order by changing darkness and matter, and on the same day JESUS Christ our Saviour arose from the dead; for on the day before Saturday they crucified Him, and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, He appeared to His Apostles and Disciples, and taught these things which we have submitted to your inspection.

Tryph 41

Καὶ ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἔλεγον, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσα, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, ΙΗΣΟΥΣ *Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν, ἵνα ἅμα τε εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ θεῷ ὑπέρ τε τοῦ τὸν κόσμον ἐκτικέναι σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας, ἐν ᾗ γεγόναμεν, ἠλευθερωκέναι ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας καταλελυκέναι τελείαν κατάλυσιν διὰ τοῦ παθητοῦ γενομένου κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ. ὅθεν περὶ μὲν τῶν ὑφ' ὑμῶν τότε προσφερομένων θυσιῶν λέγει ὁ θεός, ὡς προέφην, διὰ Μαλαχίου, ἑνὸς τῶν δώδεκα·* **Οὐκ ἔστι θέλημά μου ἐν ὑμῖν, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ τὰς θυσίας ὑμῶν οὐ προσδέξομαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν· διότι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου ἕως δυσμῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου δεδόξασται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα προσφέρεται τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ θυσία καθαρά, ὅτι μέγα τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, λέγει Κύριος, ὑμεῖς δὲ βεβηλοῦτε αὐτό.** *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρ-*

Also the meal-offering, Gentlemen, as I said, which was delivered to be offered on behalf of those cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which, for a memorial of the Passion undergone by Him on behalf of men who are being cleansed in soul from all evil, JESUS Christ our Lord delivered to be offered so that we might at the same time both give thanks to God for His creation of the world with all that is in it for man's sake, and for His having freed us from the evil in which we had come to be, and for having overthrown with a perfect overthrow principalities and authorities through Him who became subject to suffering according to His purpose. Therefore concerning the sacrifices then offered by you, God says, as we mentioned before, through Malachi, one of the twelve (prophets): "My pleasure is not in you, saith the Lord, and your sacrifices I will not accept from your hands; because from sunrise to sunset My Name has been glorified among the nations, and in every place incense is being offered to My Name and a pure sacrifice,

for great is My Name among the nations, saith the Lord, but you profane it." Concerning the sacrifices offered to Him in every place by us who are the nations, namely, the bread of the Eucharist and the cup, similarly, of the Eucharist, He foretells in that place, saying also that we glorify His Name, but that you profane it. The commandment of circumcision, bidding children be circumcised universally on the eighth day, was a type of the genuine Circumcision, with which we were circumcised from error and evil through Him who rose from the dead on the first day of the week, JESUS Christ our Lord; for the first day of the week remains first of all the days, and while according to the reckoning of all the days of the cycle it is again styled eighth, it remains also first.

του τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε εἰπὼν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζειν ἡμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ βεβηλοῦν. ἡ δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς, κελεύουσα τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ παντὸς περιτέμνειν τὰ γεννώμενα, τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς περιτομῆς, ἣν περιετμήθημεν ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ πονηρίας διὰ τοῦ ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέρᾳ ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· μία γὰρ τῶν σαββάτων, πρώτη μένουσα τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν, κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάλιν τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς κυκλοφορίας ὀγδόη καλεῖται καὶ πρώτη οὖσα μένει.

Tryph 70

Now it is clear that in this prophecy also reference is made to the bread, which our Christ delivered to us to offer for a memorial of His having become incarnate for the sake of those who believe upon Him, for whose sakes He also became subject to suffering; and to the cup, which He delivered to us to offer in the Eucharist for a memorial of His Blood.

Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ προφητείᾳ περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσασθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς αὐτόν, δι' οὓς καὶ παθητὸς γέγονε, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, ὃ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστοῦντας ποιεῖν, φαίνεται.

Tryph 116, 117

So we, who through JESUS' Name have, as one man, believed upon God, the Maker of all, having put off, through the Name of His first-begotten Son, the filthy garments, namely, our sins, and having been set on fire by the word of His calling, are the true highpriestly race of God, as even God Himself testifies, saying that in every place among the nations are those who offer sacrifices acceptable to Him and pure. Now God does not receive sacrifices from any one, except through His Priests.

Οὕτως ἡμεῖς, οἱ διὰ τοῦ ΙΗΣΟΥ ὀνόματος ὡς εἷς ἄνθρωπος πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων θεόν, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ πρωτοτόκου αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ τὰ ῥυπαρὰ ἱμάτια, τουτέστι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀπημφιεσμένοι, πυρωθέντες διὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἐσμὲν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μαρτυρεῖ, εἰπὼν ὅτι ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι θυσίας εὐαρέστους αὐτῷ καὶ καθαρὰς προσφέροντες. οὐ δέχεται δὲ παρ' οὐδενὸς θυσίας ὁ θεός, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων αὐτοῦ.

Πάσας οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου θυσίας, ἃς παρέδωκεν ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, τὰς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τῆς γῆς γινομένας ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, προλαβὼν ὁ θεὸς μαρτυρεῖ εὐαρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ· τὰς δὲ ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ δι' ἐκείνων ὑμῶν τῶν ἱερέων γινομένας ἀπαναίνεται λέγων· **Καὶ τὰς θυσίας ὑμῶν οὐ προσδέξομαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν· διότι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου ἕως δυσμῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου δεδόξασται, λέγει, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὑμεῖς δὲ βεβηλοῦτε αὐτό.** καὶ μέχρι νῦν φιλονεικοῦντες λέγετε, ὅτι τὰς μὲν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ τότε οἰκούντων Ἰσραηλιτῶν καλουμένων θυσίας οὐ προσδέχεται ὁ θεός, τὰς δὲ διὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ τότε δὴ ὄντων ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐκείνου ἀνθρώπων εὐχὰς προσίεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰρηκέναι, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς αὐτῶν θυσίας καλεῖν. ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι. ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους, ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοὺς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, μέμνηται· οὗ τὸ ὄνομα βεβηλωθῆναι κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν καὶ βλασφημεῖσθαι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ διδάσκαλοι εἰργάσαντο, ἃ ῥυπαρὰ καὶ αὐτὰ ἐνδύματα, περιτεθέντα ὑφ' ὑμῶν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ΙΗΣΟΥ γενομένοις Χριστιανοῖς, δείξει αἱρόμενα ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, ὅταν πάντας ἀναστήσῃ, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐν αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἀλύτῳ βασιλείᾳ ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀλύπους καταστήσῃ, τοὺς δὲ εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον πυρὸς παραπέμψῃ....

Οὐδὲ ἓν γὰρ ὅλως ἔστι τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων... ἐν οἷς μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ΙΗΣΟΥ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων γίνωνται.

Thus of all sacrifices through this Name, which JESUS the Christ delivered to be made, namely, in the thanksgiving of the bread and of the cup, which are indeed made in every place on earth by Christians, God testifies beforehand that they are acceptable to Him; but the sacrifices made by you and through those your priests He repudiates, saying: "Your sacrifices will I not receive from your hands; because from sunrise to sunset My Name has been glorified (He saith) among the nations, but you profane it." And until the present you assert controversially, that the sacrifices made in Jerusalem in the days of those who then resided there and were called Israelites, God does not accept, but that He said He approves the prayers made by those of that race of men, then in the Dispersion, and called their prayers sacrifices. That indeed both prayers and thanksgivings, made by the worthy, are alone perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God, I also say. For these only did Christians also receive that they should offer, even in memorial of their food, both solid and liquid, in which is also commemorated the Passion which the Son of God underwent for their sakes: Whose name the high-priests and teachers of your nation caused to be profaned and blasphemed throughout all the earth; and these same filthy garments which you put on all those who from the name of JESUS have become Christians, God will display, taken off from us, when He shall raise all men and establish some in an everlasting and indissoluble Kingdom to be incorruptible and immortal and griefless, but despatch others into an everlasting chastisement of fire....

For there is not even a single race of men among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not made to the Father and Maker of all through the name of the crucified JESUS.

ii. S. Irenaeus, c. Haereses

IV. xvii. 4—5

From all which it is evident that God did not require from them sacrifices and burnt-offerings, but faith and obedience and justice, for their salvation. As in the prophet Hosea God taught them His will and said: "I desire mercy rather than sacrifice, and acknowledgment of God above burnt-offerings." But in fact our Lord gave them the same admonitions, saying: "If you had known what is meant by: 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice,' you would never have condemned the innocent," thus witnessing to the Prophets that they preached the truth, and convicting those of folly of their own fault. Moreover giving to His Disciples counsel to offer firstfruits to God from His creatures, not as to one who stands in need, but so that they may be neither unfruitful nor thankless, He took bread which is of creation, and gave thanks, saying: "This is My Body." And the cup, similarly, which is of the same creation as ourselves, He declared to be His Blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Covenant; and this the Church received from the Apostles, and offers throughout the whole world to God, to Him who affords us food, as firstfruits of His gifts in the New Covenant, of which among the twelve Prophets Malachi thus foreshowed: "My will is not in you, saith the Almighty Lord, and I will not receive sacrifice from your hands. For from sunrise even to sunset My name is glorified among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to My name, and a pure sacrifice: for My name is great among the nations, said the Almighty Lord"; very evidently meaning

Ex quibus omnibus manifestum est, quia non sacrificia et holocaustomata quaerebat ab eis Deus; sed fidem, et obedientiam, et justitiam, propter illorum salutem. Sicut in Osee propheta docens eos Deus suam voluntatem, dicebat: "Misericordiam volo quam sacrificium, et agnitionem Dei super holocaustomata." Sed et Dominus noster eadem monebat eos, dicens: "Si enim cognovissetis quid est, 'Misericordiam volo, et non sacrificium,' nunquam condemnassetis innocentes": testimonium quidem reddens prophetis, quoniam veritatem praedicabant; illos autem arguens sua culpa insipientes. Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura est panis, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: "**Hoc est meum corpus.**" Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem; quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo ei qui alimenta nobis praestat primitias suorum munerum in novo Testamento, de quo in duodecim prophetis Malachias sic praesignificavit: "Non est mihi voluntas in vobis, dicit Dominus omnipotens, et sacrificium non accipiam de manibus vestris. Quoniam ab ortu solis usque ad occasum nomen meum clarificatur inter gentes, et in omni loco incensum offertur nomini meo, et sacrificium purum: quoniam magnum est nomen meum in gentibus, dicit

Dominus omnipotens"; manifestissime significans per haec, quoniam prior quidem populus cessabit offerre Deo; omni autem loco sacrificium offeretur ei, et hoc purum; nomen autem ejus glorificatur in gentibus.

by these words, that whereas the former people shall cease to offer to God, yet in every place sacrifice will be offered to Him, and that pure; His name is made glorious among the nations.

IV. XVIII. 1—4

Igitur Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert, glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus....

Therefore the oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught to be offered throughout the whole world, has been reckoned a pure sacrifice with God, and is acceptable to Him: not that He is in need of sacrifice from us, but because he who offers is himself glorified in what he offers, if his gift be accepted....

Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturae, sicut et Moyses ait: "Non apparebis vacuus ante conspectum Domini Dei tui"; ut in quibus gratus exstitit homo, in his gratus (esse) deputatus, eum qui est ab eo percipiat honorem. Et non genus oblationum reprobatum est: oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic: sacrificia in populo, sacrificia et in Ecclesia: sed species mutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis, sed a liberis offeratur....

We ought, therefore, to offer to God firstfruits of His creation, as also Moses says: "Thou shalt not appear empty in the sight of the Lord thy God"; so that a man, being counted grateful in that wherein he is indeed grateful, may receive the honour which is of God. And oblation as such is not repudiated, for there are oblations here as well as there: sacrifices in the Church as well as sacrifices in the (Jewish) people; but it is the kind only which is changed, since offering is made now, not by slaves but by freemen....

Igitur non sacrificia sanctificant hominem; non enim indiget sacrificio Deus: sed conscientia ejus qui offert sanctificat sacrificium, pura exsistens, et praestat acceptare Deum quasi ab amico. "Peccator autem," inquit, "qui occidit mihi vitulum, quasi occidat canem." Quoniam igitur cum simplicitate Ecclesia offert, juste munus ejus purum sacrificium apud Deum deputatum est. Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus ait: "Repletus sum acceptis ab Epaphrodito, quae a vobis missa sunt, odorem suavitatis, hostiam acceptabilem, placentem Deo." Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus

Therefore sacrifices do not sanctify a man; for God stands in no need of sacrifice: but, if it is pure, the conscience of him who offers sanctifies the sacrifice and causes God to accept it as from a friend. "If a sinner," He declares, "kill a calf for Me, it is as if he killed a dog." Since therefore the Church makes her offerings with simplicity, her gift is rightly accounted a pure sacrifice before God. Like as Paul also says to the Philippians: "I am full with what I have received from Epaphroditus sent by you, an odour of sweetness, an acceptable sacrifice, pleasing to God." For we ought to make oblation to God, and

in everything be found grateful to God our Creator, in purity of mind and faith without pretence, in firmness of hope, in fervency of love, offering firstfruits of these His creatures. And this oblation the Church alone offers pure to the Creator, offering to Him of His creation with thanksgiving....

And how will they be assured that this bread over which thanks have been given, is the Body of their Lord, and that the cup contains His Blood, if they do not say that He is Son of the Creator of the world, that is, His Word, by which trees bear fruit, and fountains flow, and the earth gives first the blade, then afterwards the ear, then the full corn in the ear? And how can they assert that the flesh is destined to corruption, and does not share in life, whiles it is nourished from the Body of the Lord, and from His Blood? Either they must change their views, or renounce the said oblations. But our view is consonant with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our view. We offer to Him His own, thus fittingly announcing fellowship and union of flesh and spirit. For as bread from the earth when it receives the invocation of God is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, both an earthly and an heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have the hope of the resurrection to eternity....

So also therefore He would have us offer a gift at the altar often and without ceasing. Now the altar is in the heavens, for thither our prayers and offerings are directed; and (there also is) the Temple, as John says in the Apocalypse: "And the temple of God was opened," and the Tabernacle: "For behold," he says, "the tabernacle of God, in which He will dwell with men."

gratos inveniri fabricatori Deo, in sententia pura et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in dilectione ferventi, primitias earum, quae sunt ejus, creaturarum offerentes. Et hanc oblationem Ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus....

Quomodo autem constabit eis, eum panem in quo gratiae actae sint, corpus esse Domini sui, et calicem sanguinis ejus, si non ipsum fabricatoris mundi Filium dicant, id est, Verbum ejus, per quod lignum fructificat, et effluunt fontes, et terra dat primum quidem foenum, post deinde spicam, deinde plenum triticum in spica? *Πῶς τὴν σάρκα λέγουσιν εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ* Κυρίου *καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφομένην; ἢ τὴν γνώμην ἀλλαξάτωσαν, ἢ τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα παραιτείσθωσαν. ἡμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία βεβαιοῖ τὴν γνώμην. προσφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια, ἐμμελῶς κοινωνίαν καὶ ἕνωσιν ἀπαγγέλλοντες σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος. ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου, οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτά, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα....*

Sic et ideo quoque offerre vult munus ad altare frequenter sine intermissione. Est ergo altare in coelis, illuc enim preces nostrae et oblationes nostrae diriguntur; et templum, quemadmodum Johannes in Apocalypsi ait: "Et apertum est templum Dei"; et tabernaculum: "Ecce enim," inquit, "tabernaculum Dei, in quo habitabit cum hominibus."

IV. XXXIII. 2

Quomodo autem juste Dominus, si alterius patris exsistit, hujus conditionis quae est secundum nos accipiens panem suum corpus esse confitebatur, et temperamentum calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit?

For, if He were indeed from another Father, how could the Lord rightly take bread of the same nature as ourselves, and declare it to be His Body, and affirm that the mixed cup was His Blood?

V. II. 1—3

Si autem non salvetur haec, videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus communicatio corporis ejus est. Sanguis enim non est nisi a venis et carnibus, et a reliqua quae est secundum hominem substantia, qua vere factum Verbum Dei sanguine suo redemit nos. Quemadmodum et Apostolus ejus ait: "In quo habemus redemtionem per sanguinem ejus, et remissionem peccatorum."

But if the flesh is not saved, the Lord did not redeem us by His Blood, and neither is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His Blood, nor is the bread which we break the communion of His Body. For blood is not, except from veins and flesh, and from the rest of human substance, wherein being truly made the Word of God redeemed us by His Blood. As also His Apostle says: "In whom we have redemption by His Blood, and remission of sins."

Ἐπειδὴ μέλη αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ διὰ τῆς κτίσεως τρεφόμεθα· τὴν δὲ κτίσιν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς παρέχει, τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλων, καὶ βρέχων καθὼς βούλεται, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ποτήριον αἷμα ἴδιον ὡμολόγησεν, ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἡμέτερον δεύει αἷμα· καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ἄρτον ἴδιον σῶμα διεβεβαιώσατο, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ ἡμέτερα αὔξει σώματα. ὁπότε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἐκ τούτων δὲ αὔξει καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις· πῶς δεκτικὴν μὴ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου τρεφομένην, καὶ μέλος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν; καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλός φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· **ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ**· οὐ περὶ πνευματικοῦ τινος καὶ ἀοράτου ἀνθρώπου λέγων ταῦτα· τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα οὔτε ὀστέα, οὔτε σάρκα ἔχει· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἄνθρω-

And because we are members of Him, and nourished by the creation,—and the creation He provides for us, making His sun arise and sending rain, according to His will,—the cup from the creation He declared to be His own Blood (outpoured), from which He impregnates our blood; and the bread from the creation He confirmed to be His own Body, from which He nourishes our bodies. When therefore both the mixed cup and the made (broken) bread receive the word of God, and the Eucharist becomes Body of Christ, and from these the essence of our flesh is nourished and sustained; how can they assert that the flesh is not receptive of the gift of God, which is life everlasting, seeing that it is nourished from the Body and Blood of the Lord, and is a member of Him? As the blessed Paul says in the Epistle to the Ephesians: "For we are members of His body, out of His flesh, and out of His bones."

He does not state this of any spiritual and invisible man; for the spirit has neither bones nor flesh; but concerning the truly human system, which consists of flesh and muscles and bones; which is nourished both from the cup which is His Blood, and from the bread, which is His Body.

πον οἰκονομίας, τῆς ἐκ σαρκὸς καὶ νεύρων καὶ ὀστέων συνεστώσης· ἥτις καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου, ὅ ἐστι τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, τρέφεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὅ ἐστι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, αὔξεται.

And in what manner the wood of the vine laid in the soil in its proper season bears fruit, and as the grain of wheat, falling into the soil and dissolved, is raised manifold through the Spirit of God, who upholds all things; and as these then through the wisdom of God come to men's use, and, receiving the word of God, become Eucharist, which is Body and Blood of Christ,—so also our bodies being nourished from it (the Eucharist), and put into the ground, and dissolved in it, shall rise again in their proper season, when the Word of God vouchsafes awakening to them unto the glory of our God and Father.

Καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου κλιθὲν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ ἐκαρποφόρησε, καὶ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθείς, πολλοστὸς ἐγέρθη διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ συνέχοντος τὰ πάντα· ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ τῆς σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν ἐλθόντα ἀνθρώποις, καὶ προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα ἐξ αὐτῆς τρεφόμενα, καὶ τεθέντα εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ διαλυθέντα ἐν αὐτῇ, ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ, τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῖς χαριζομένου εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ καὶ πατρός.

From a Letter of Irenaeus:

Eus *HE* v. 24[15–17]

But the Presbyters before your time, who did not observe (so), used to send Eucharist to the distant Presbyters who did (so) observe. And when the blessed Polycarp was staying at Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they had little differences about some other matters, they made peace without delay....

Ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν. καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιδημήσαντος τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀνικήτου, καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν μικρὰ σχόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, εὐθὺς εἰρήνευσαν....

And this being so, they made fellowship with each other, and in Church Anicetus handed over the Eucharist to Polycarp, evidently out of respect, and they parted from each other in peace, the whole Church being at peace, both those that (so) observed and those that did not.

Καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ κατ' ἐντροπὴν δηλονότι, καὶ μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἀπηλλάγησαν, πάσης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνην ἐχόντων καὶ τῶν τηρούντων καὶ τῶν μὴ τηρούντων.

PART II

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST

THE Eucharist was instituted at the Last Supper by Christ Himself in the presence of His chosen Apostles. A special revelation to S. Paul excepted, all accounts of the Institution are therefore derived from eleven eye-witnesses. In the short narratives included in the canonical Scriptures and associated with the names of SS. Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul, there may be a purely human element to be sifted out: and the accounts of Justin and Irenaeus are not independent but ancillary. To all these it will be well to apply "critical methods" not only with caution and reserve but with tenderness and gratitude, in order to observe how the seed planted by the Lord in the Last Supper struck roots downward into men's hearts and sent out shoots upward towards God. In the organic growth of the Eucharist, the inarticulate and potential became the articulate and kinetic, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The whole truth unfolded itself: what was old was seen to be new, and what seemed new was found to be old.

The earliest written record of the Institution of the Eucharist occurs in S. Paul's First Epistle to the Church at Corinth, written about 55 A.D. in the course of the third missionary journey. The Epistle had its occasional as well as its eternal significance. It is an Apostolic rebuke and exhortation addressed to a Church under the direct supervision of the writer, a Church which has fallen from its good estate. Instead of unity internal divisions and dissensions prevail, both of belief and of practice. Gross sins have been committed by individuals and tolerated by the community. The discipline

of the Church is very relaxed. Even the Lord's Supper, which should solemnly recall the Last Supper of the Lord, has become the scene of self-assertion and self-indulgence. Unity is a foregone blessing; these professing Christians have forgotten that they are members of one body, the Body of Christ; and so they have come to neglect and abuse the opportunities of fellowship and unity in the sacred Ordinance of the Lord. Such is the tenour of the Epistle.

In rebuking those who eat and drink with thanksgiving in a disorderly manner S. Paul finds it good to recount the Institution of the Feast which they defamed. He is recounting what he had taught already, and his résumé is succinct; his words are:

1 Cor 11^{23-25}

23 Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον 24 καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΤΟ ὑΠΕΡ ὙΜΩΝ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ. 25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΕΜΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ, ΟΣΑΚΙΣ ΕΑΝ ΠΙΝΗΤΕ, ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ.

In the opening words the force of the preposition in *ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου* is direct communication, so that, whether the Apostle received a direct revelation from his Lord or not, he at least regards himself as having been the recipient of the information in so direct a fashion that the channel was a negligible factor in its transmission. This truth he had handed on to the Corinthians on an earlier occasion, during the second missionary journey, and had instructed them how to be obedient to the Lord's commands. He had taught them his ways in Christ JESUS as he was wont to teach everywhere in every Church. And as throughout the Epistle he is careful to distinguish between his own directions and the ordinances of the Lord, reflexion will attach to S. Paul's words greater and greater authority and significance; and the very plainness and conciseness of the report testify to its inestimable value as an historical record.

The Apostle relates that the Lord JESUS on the night when His betrayal was being carried out,—whether that was the evening of the Passover or not, is not mentioned,—took a cake of bread, and offered thanks, and broke it, and declared it to be His Body which was on their behalf. The Lord then enjoined that they should "be doing this" for His memorial. Also the Lord

proceeded similarly with the cup at the close of the meal. He declared it to be the new covenant in His Blood, and bade them do this, whenever they drank it, for His memorial.

The few and simple words ascribed to the Lord are majestic in their transparency and depth; they are the utterances of One like whom "never man spake." Their full meaning transcends exegesis: even experience can only taste their transcendent truth. Ἐστιν translated by *is* indicates an identity which penetrates to the source of reality, and it may be doubted whether any identities, which seem easier to understand, are comparable with this mystical identity. Further restriction or definition of the identity of the bread and the Body, of the cup and the Blood, is in danger of taking for the Divine fulness the content of an earthen vessel.

To scholars, whose judgments on such matters most students would wish to follow, the Lord's language: τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, has a "sacrificial ring," and at the least the words are patient of a sacrificial sense. Sacrifice was undoubtedly in S. Paul's mind somewhat earlier in the Epistle, but the consideration of the precise nature of the conclusions to be derived therefrom must be postponed.

The phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is especially noteworthy; it is not stated to whom the words refer; nor is the destiny of the Body devoted for the Disciples specified: S. Paul is only refreshing the memories of his readers. To supply διδόμενον, and to interpret ὑμῶν of the Church represented in the Apostles, appears perfectly legitimate, if the balance of the interpretation be maintained by recollection of the preparatory discourse in the fourth Gospel: ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν Ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ Μου ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, and of the περὶ, ὑπὲρ, πολλῶν of the first two Gospels.

The expression ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη has a backward reference to ἡ παλαία διαθήκη instituted through Moses on Sinai: "Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgements...and Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the mount...and Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you upon all these conditions." The Author of the New Covenant points to His Cross as the Sacrifice consummating and sealing it.

Lastly, the solemn rite is to be repeated for His memorial, for a remembrance of Him. The Apostles, and therefore the Church, were to recall and

repeat this Last Meal, indissolubly linked to the Lord's Death, and so fraught with the significance and the grace of that saving event.

The next account of the Institution inviting examination is contained in the second Gospel, and the tradition there crystallised cannot have a date posterior to that of the Epistle just discussed. The passage quoted follows a reference to the traitor's presence at the outset of the meal, which was understood to be paschal:

Mc 14^{22-24}

22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

That is to say, during the evening meal JESUS took a cake, blessed, broke, and gave to His Disciples, bidding them take that which was His Body. He then took a cup, offered thanks, and gave to them, whereupon "they drank of it, all." He declared it to be His Blood of the Covenant, being shed on behalf of many; and added that he would not drink wine again until He drank it new in the Kingdom of God.

There is in the Epistle already cited a clear indication of the use of wine at the Lord's Supper, and in the present evangelical record the writer evidently understands the cup to contain "the fruit of the vine," and not water merely. This will be seen to be the testimony of the first Gospel, and the most reasonable supposition in the case of the third. Such a concurrence of evidence renders it audacious to assume the employment of water only in the Eucharists of the first century; and there is clear evidence against such a strange usage at a later date.

It may be inferred from verse 25 that the Institution took place at the close of the Supper; and the inference becomes a certainty if the order of words in the third Gospel be weighed. The further discussion of this deeply interesting verse lies outside our purpose.

The graphic touch: *καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, is a reminder of the well-known description of S. Mark as *interpres Petri*. The Disciples obeyed the bidding of their Lord: probably the Eleven, for the first two Gospels are silent concerning the departure of the traitor, and textual considerations suggest that the third may not be entirely accurate in the sequence of events.

The Lord's words on the identity of the bread with His Body are recorded simply by S. Mark. In the case of the cup, he relates more. It is the Blood of the Lord; for Μου cannot belong to *διαθήκης*, and indeed in the preceding verse there is the parallel construction *τὸ σῶμά* Μου. Further the Lord's Blood is associated with a covenant, the Covenant; and it is being shed on behalf of many. The phrase of the Old Testament, *τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης*, is reproduced.

The third source of evidence for the Institution is found in the first Gospel, according to S. Matthew. Without entering into the question of the date, authorship and homogeneity of the Gospel, it may be remarked that the passage in point belongs to the class characterised by the closest resemblance to the tradition enshrined in S. Mark's Gospel. On the evening of the first day of unleavened bread, JESUS is reclining at supper with His Disciples, and confronts the traitor with his treachery. The narrative then proceeds:

Mt 26^{26-28}

26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν· Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, 28 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

At the close of the Meal JESUS took a cake and blessed and broke, and gave to His Disciples bidding them take and eat, it was His Body. Then He took a cup, gave thanks, and gave to them with the invitation, "Drink of it, all of you," it was His Blood of the Covenant being shed in the matter of many for remission of sins. He then solemnly avowed that He would not drink henceforward any wine until He came to drink it new with them in the Kingdom of His Father.

There is a stronger note of personal appeal in this narrative than in the companion account of S. Mark. The Evangelist dwells with loving interest upon the minutiae of acts and words. The Disciples are encouraged not only to take but to eat the bread, all to drink of the cup; and the Lord will not merely drink new wine in the Kingdom of God, but drink it with them, and in His Father's Kingdom. The same five simple words assert the identity of the bread and the Body; but the identity of the cup with the Blood, pertaining to the Covenant, is accompanied by a definition of the benefit

that many will derive from the shedding of His Blood, the remission of their sins. The words *περὶ πολλῶν* are wider than the *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* of the Pauline account; and the word *περί* may have a sacrificial connotation[1] arising out of its use in the Old Testament.

The remaining canonical record of the Institution is from the pen of a professed historian, S. Luke[2]. Its value is peculiarly high, for though the writer was not a hearer of the Lord, he had been diligent in following up everything to its source and wrote with care so that he might secure an advance on oral tradition in respect of accuracy. His account runs:

Lc 22^{19-20}

19 Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

On the evening of the day of unleavened bread, at the hour of the paschal meal, JESUS reclined at meat with the Apostles. He expressed His earnest longing to eat the Passover with them before suffering, and declared that He would not eat it again until the consummation in the Kingdom of God. Then He received a cup, gave thanks and bade them take it and divide it among themselves, and said that He would not drink wine again until the coming of the Kingdom of God. At this climax He took a cake, gave thanks, broke, gave to them, and said that it was His Body which was being given on their behalf, and bade them do it for His memorial. In the same way, after supper, with the cup, declaring it to be the New Covenant in His Blood which was being poured out on their behalf. The Gospel then reports the denunciation of the traitor.

A sense of the imminence of a terrible and tragic event is transfused throughout the measured language of the writer. The eating and drinking of the paschal supper are the Lord's very last participation in such familiar intercourse before His Death on the Cross: in two opening verses is conveyed a reiterated assurance of the finality of the meal. And so when they have partaken, amid the gracious and solemn revelation of the future which the

[1] Cf Clem Rom 41^{2} *Θυσίαι περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, and Ro 8^{3}, He 13^{11}.

[2] The full text is read with confidence after a consideration of the textual evidence which will be found in Appendix A.

Lord vouchsafes, He gives to them, in addition to the earthly refreshment of which they have partaken, the heavenly food so long promised, and the Last Supper of the Old Testament is the First Supper of the New. The New Covenant is sealed by anticipation; a perpetual Memorial is secured; the surrendered Body and the outpoured Blood are bestowed upon the Apostles to be the everlasting treasure of the Church, freely to bestow, as they were freely received.

If the limits of the canonical writings are overstepped, two accounts present themselves, belonging, it is true, to the second century, but strikingly corroborative, and deserving from their early date to be compared with the four already discussed.

The first of these is given by Justin Martyr, a Syrian by birth, resident sometime at Ephesus and afterwards at Rome. The passage to be quoted is near the end of his First Apology addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and ascribed to a date not remote from A.D. 140. It runs as follows:

1 Apol 66

Οἱ γὰρ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν ΙΗΣΟΥΝ λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗCΙΝ ΜΟΥ, ΤΟΥΤΕCΤΙ ΤΟ CΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτό ἐCΤΙΝ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι.

Thus according to the best of Justin's knowledge, derived from Apostolic writings, JESUS took a cake and gave thanks and commanded to do this for His memorial, saying at the same time that it was His Body. He then proceeded in like manner to take the cup, and gave thanks and said that it was His Blood. Only the Apostles received them.

The command τοῦτο ποιεῖτε expressed in the case of the bread is probably carried on by ὁμοίως to the cup also, although in the latter case the command is not explicitly recorded, a remark applying also to the Lucan account, in which a similar omission occurs. The remission of sins is not mentioned: it may have been thought too hard for a pagan reader; and the same may account for the omission of "given for you," "shed for you," if it be deliberate. The simpler idea of a memorial is made prominent, and indeed given the first place on Christ's lips. The Apostles, representing

the Church of Christ, alone received these eternal gifts: to them alone was addressed the command: to them alone was committed the authority so to make a perpetual memorial of the Lord JESUS.

The second of the accounts is given by Irenaeus, the pioneer of a succession of Doctors of the Church who built upon broad and firm foundations of Gospel Truth, with the Incarnation for the corner-stone, the Catholic view of God, Man and the World. In his letter to Florinus Irenaeus tells how, while still a boy, he witnessed Polycarp's daily life and listened to his narration of past intercourse with men who had seen the Lord. At the time of the martyrdom of Polycarp, about the middle of the second century, Irenaeus was at Rome. Later he became the successor of Pothinus in the see of Lyons. Thus East and West united in a man of great saintliness, much learning, wide travel, and episcopal rank in the Church. His great work against Heresies contains this passage:

Contra Haer. IV. xvii. 5

Sed et Suis Discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex Suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura est panis accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: HOC EST MEUM CORPUS. Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos, SUUM SANGUINEM confessus est, et NOVI TESTAMENTI NOVAM docuit OBLATIONEM; quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo.....

The Lord took ordinary bread, and gave thanks, and said that it was His Body; and the cup in the same way He declared to be His Blood, and so taught the oblation of the New Covenant. This oblation the Church received from the Apostles, and everywhere duly offers.

It is observable however that the passage is disappointing in three ways; it is extant only in Latin, it is only an epitome of what was well known, and it relapses into paraphrase at the bestowal of the cup. Fortunately, however, these defects can be partially remedied by the habit of reiteration which the writer evinces. In fact where Greek and Latin are extant together in the course of the work, the phrases of the first part of the account recur so that the reconstruction of the original Greek is, for the first half, a matter of considerable certainty. For the second half, the paraphrase of the Lord's words over the cup is found in another context, and so as to make it clear what Irenaeus thought those words to have been.

Thus the first half of the passage contains the significant words: ...panem accepit (JESUS), et gratias egit, dicens: HOC EST MEUM CORPUS. Et calicem similiter.... These may be at once retranslated: ...*λαβὼν ὁ* ΙΗΣΟΥΣ *ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν·* ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ. *καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως....*

The second half: ...Suum Sanguinem confessus est, et Novi Testamenti...docuit oblationem, may be transformed into *oratio recta* by comparing the language of IV. xxxiii. 2: ...Dominus...accipiens panem Suum Corpus esse confitebatur, et temperamentum calicis Suum Sanguinem confirmavit. What the Lord actually said of the bread was, according to the Latin version of Irenaeus: HOC EST MEUM CORPUS; and therefore by comparing: panem Suum Corpus esse confitebatur, with: Hoc est Meum Corpus, it appears that to: calicem Suum Sanguinem confessus est, corresponds the direct speech: HIC EST MEUS SANGUIS. Irenaeus would therefore have in mind, whilst writing the account, something undistinguishable from:

εἶπεν· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ.

This result is confirmed by a passage in which both Greek and Latin are extant (V. ii. 3):

ἥτις καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου, ὅ ἐστι τὸ Αἷμα Αὐτοῦ, τρέφεται,
quae de calice, qui est Sanguis Ejus, nutritur,
καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὅ ἐστι τὸ Σῶμα Αὐτοῦ, αὔξεται.
et de pane, quod est Corpus Ejus, augetur.

Finally there is needed a Greek equivalent for the words: Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem: this may be supplied by

...ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ.

Thus it is highly probable that the account of the Institution to which Irenaeus held had the following form:

Λαβὼν ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ *ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν·* ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ. *καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως λαβὼν εἶπεν·* ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ.

The final command to do this would seem to apply to the whole rite, and not to the cup alone.

The six Accounts are now exhibited, as opposite, in tabular form, so as to facilitate comparison. Replete as they are with minor variations, the very character of these divergences may serve to increase the conviction that they

COMPARISON OF ACCOUNTS OF INSTITUTION

(MATTHEW), A.D. 80	MARK, A.D. 70	LUKE, A.D. 80	PAUL, A.D. 55	JUSTIN, A.D. 140	(IRENAEUS), A.D. 180
Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν	Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν	Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ...	Ὁ κύριος ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο		
λαβὼν ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν	λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων	ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν	τὸν ΙΗΣΟΥΝ λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν	λαβὼν ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν
ΛΆΒΕΤΕ ΦΆΓΕΤΕ, ΤΟΥΤΌ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΆ ΜΟΥ.	ΛΆΒΕΤΕ, ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΆ ΜΟΥ.	ΤΟΥΤΌ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΆ ΜΟΥ ΤΟ ΥΠΈΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΔΙΔΌΜΕΝΟΝ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΆΜΝΗΣΙΝ.	ΤΟΥΤΌ ΜΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΤΟ ΥΠΈΡ ΥΜΩΝ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΆΜΝΗΣΙΝ.	ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ ΜΟΥ, ΤΟΥΤΕΣΤΙ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΆ ΜΟΥ·	ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΆ ΜΟΥ.
καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων	καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων	ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως λαβὼν εἶπεν
ΠΊΕΤΕ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ΠΆΝΤΕΣ, ΤΟΥΤΟ ΓΆΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΆ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΉΚΗΣ ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ ἐΚΧΥΝΝΌΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΙΣ ἌΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ.	ΤΟΥΤΌ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΆ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΉΚΗΣ ΤΟ ἐΚΧΥΝΝΌΜΕΝΟΝ ΥΠΈΡ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ.	ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΉΡΙΟΝ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΉΚΗ ἐΝ ΤΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ ΜΟΥ, ΤΟ ΥΠΈΡ ΥΜΩΝ ἐΚΧΥΝΝΌΜΕΝΟΝ.	ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΉΡΙΟΝ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΉΚΗ ἐΣΤΙΝ ἐΝ ΤΩ ἘΜΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ, ΌΣΑΚΙΣ ἐΑΝ ΠΊΝΗΤΕ, ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ἘΜΗΝ ἈΝΆΜΝΗΣΙΝ.	ΤΟΥΤΟ ἐΣΤΙΝ ΑΙΜΆ ΜΟΥ.	ΤΟΥΤΟ ἐΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΆ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΉΚΗΣ· ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ.

arise out of an objective historical event; the main features of this event are beyond all doubt or cavil:

The Lord before His Death
took a cake and gave thanks and said:
THIS IS MY BODY;
and took a cup in like manner and said:
THIS IS MY BLOOD.

This highest common factor of the Accounts represents that which, in the opinion of SS. Matthew, Peter, and Paul, Luke, Justin and Irenaeus, was central and essential in the Last Supper.

In appraising the factors not common to all it will be fair to emphasise those which are attested by several, of which at least one is canonical; and indeed apart from minor considerations of sequence there is little reason for rejecting any statement that is made by any single one of the authorities. For instance, it is absolutely certain that the cake was broken; in respect of this the four canonical accounts agree, and it is also clear that Justin and Irenaeus are aware of this, and that it is the universal practice of the Church in their time. Although Justin does not directly mention fraction, the cake set before the President in the Eucharistic celebration was distributed to the faithful, and so was broken; and Irenaeus asseverates that the "bread which we break" is the "communion of His Body." Before we proceed further in the synthesis of the Accounts, however, their relationship will need to be studied, and a few general remarks may be prefaced.

A striking defect in much "modern" historical research is the haphazard application of the theory of development, or principle of continuity, of which the word "evolution" is the keynote. Facts are harassed and violated until they shall display a smooth sequence which is often quite foreign to them. Arrangement in chronological order leading to detection of progressive variation is obviously an effective process for the discovery of truth, but the requisite labour and caution are not always to be detected in the writings of those who apply themselves to follow the evolutionary method of investigation. The method is too often associated with a play of the imagination which leads to views of great novelty and small permanence. One of the most eminent historians of this class discourages enthusiastic views of the penetrative power of "historical science" by the naïve confession that hopelessly irreconcileable conclusions may be drawn by competent

scholars from the same facts: "there is this difference between the progress of physical and the progress of historical science; that in the case of physical science men usually grow towards an agreement, but in the case of historical research they do not necessarily do so[1]."

The broad views which are the boast of the high evolutionary school are not always as legitimate as they are easy and attractive. One example, not taken from any particular writer, may serve to illustrate the danger of the hasty application of "evolutionary principles" in the present field of investigation. With the hypothesis of two independent traditions of the Institution which may be indicated by "Mc-Mt" and "Lc-Pl," it is natural enough to predict their combination and expansion in a later form, current in the Church of the middle of the second century, and indicated by "Ju-Ir." The course of development, as observed in acts of martyrs and lives of saints, is generally observed to be accompanied by accretion and accumulation. Now in the present case this is flatly contradicted by facts. The Ju-Ir account of the Institution is singularly brief, and much shorter than the earlier Mc-Mt and Lc-Pl narratives. Indeed the course of history does not necessarily coincide with the path of least resistance in the mind of an enquirer, and events have not always come to pass, or been brought to pass, in the particular manner which comes easiest to the understanding of the historian. The explanation is to be found, not in a principle, but in a fact: namely, that Apostolic tradition was guarded with jealous care, and the "natural tendency" to accretion was resisted by the will of man furthered by the hand of God.

Far from decrying the proper application of the "evolutionary method," we try to recognise fully that where evolution ceases, thought is generally wasted; evolution by continuous variation in a sequence of cause and effect is an absolute necessity of thought in the scientific investigation of that into which time enters.

As suggested in the example which has been dismissed, the six Accounts of the Institution can be arranged in pairs of closely similar narratives,

Mc, Mt : Pl, Lc : Ju, Ir.

[1] Dr P. Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, 1899, p. 168. The dictum seems to be regarded as a general proposition, of which a special case is the assertion: "It is certainly not true that a careful and erudite study of the origins of Christianity will bring all men alike into harmonious views as to the person and work" of JESUS (*l.c.*),—a small truth, or else a great untruth.

The first pair are part of the primitive tradition common to the first two Gospels, and so unquestionably belong to the middle of the first century; the second pair cannot be put appreciably later; and the third pair balance about the middle of the second century. In each case the written accounts represent a belief current for some time before the actual date of writing; and this enhances the validity of the dates assigned. There is also indicated an entire absence of essential variation, between the years 50 and 180, in the conception of what occurred a little before the year 30.

Throughout the main outline of the first Gospel the narrative of the second Gospel was familiar to the editor, and this identity or similarity evinces itself in their accounts of the Institution. The two accounts are congruent, except for the following variations. For the Marcan act: καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, the first Gospel has the spoken word of the Lord: πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες; for the Marcan ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, it has περὶ πολλῶν; and the additions φάγετε and εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν are made by the first Gospel to the words of bestowal of the bread and of the cup respectively. The last words define the efficacy of the outpouring of the Lord's Blood in the matter of many: it will secure the remission of sins; and this is the final statement of the Lord concerning the cup, for comparison with the Lucan account proves that the verse there following is only an emphatic assertion that the Supper is the Last Supper. Whether the words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν are allowed to have been used by the Lord on that occasion, or not,—doubtless they were, though recorded only in one Gospel,—they explain περὶ πολλῶν in a way agreeable to the attitude of the Gospels towards Christ's Death, as a voluntary Self-sacrifice on behalf of others. The words are a testimony to the redemptive power of the Death on the Cross, but no less do they assert in their context the cleansing virtue of the Lord's Blood; simply and plainly they propound the mysterious and glorious truth of saving grace proceeding through earthly channels.

The first two Gospels present therefore this stereotyped form of a very primitive tradition; the one probably consonant with S. Peter's preaching of the Gospel; the other, at the least, approved by those who towards the close of the first century gave to the first Gospel its finality of form, and who must have been in close communion with Apostolic teaching. The old popularity of the first, and the new popularity of the second

Gospel, give to their united and congruent testimony a peculiar interest and importance.

Close resemblance and underlying independence co-exist in the third and fourth Accounts, whilst their common divergences from the first two Synoptists are so striking that beyond a doubt they do not derive from Mt-Mc. The essay to vindicate the full text of Lc leads to the conclusion that the Pauline story, committed earlier to writing, was not copied by S. Luke. A contemporary would surely have expected pretty much the same description of the Last Supper from SS. Paul and Luke, and not merely because the latter was likely to reproduce something from the sermons or correspondence of the former. The Evangelist's researches into evidence, his consultations with eyewitnesses, his dissatisfaction with some extant histories,—these were not the affair of a day or a year. For a long period he must have been keenly observant to gather all the authentic information accessible to him. Whether or no the brother whose praise all Christians knew to be in the Gospel was S. Luke, it is plausible to see S. Paul deriving from his labours and researches much of his own knowledge of Christ's life. But the resemblance of the Pl-Lc accounts does not imply that their joint value does not exceed that of either alone; they corroborate each other. In the one resides the fruit of patient investigation by a follower of the Apostles who has shown himself throughout his work to possess the historical charism; in the other is contained the authoritative teaching in Christ, as disseminated over the world by him, whom no man but himself would call "the least of the Apostles."

The verbal divergences in Lc and Pl have been detailed, and there are no essential variations to note. Comparison of the Mt-Mc pair with Lc-Pl leaves the question of precedence in authority unsettled, if the question need be raised. The circumstances of the Supper agree so far as they are specified, except that Lc departs from the chronological order of Mt-Mc in putting the prediction of the betrayal after the Institution, and omits the acted parable of the washing of feet which was directed against an evil rivalry. Yet the introduction is fuller in Lc; the words are recorded by which Christ recalled the emulous Disciples to their proper selves and helped them to realise the solemnity and finality of what He proceeded to do. In one point the Lucan arrangement of incident may be revised; comparison of Mc and Mt with the Johannine narrative confirms what a sense of the

fitness of things forcibly suggests, that Judas the traitor was not a partaker of the first Eucharist[1]. The hypothesis of a later insertion introduced into the first draft of the third Gospel alleviates the difficulty of traversing S. Luke's testimony in this detail.

Further divergence between Mc-Mt and Lc-Pl is to be noted in the time-mark: *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι*, at the bestowal of the cup in the latter pair of accounts, which again describe the cup as: *τὸ ποτήριον*, whilst in Mc-Mt the cup has no such time-mark attached to it, and *ποτήριον* is anarthrous. It seems clear that *ὡσαύτως* and *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* are adverbial clauses to be associated together with a verb not expressed but easily understood: the one modal, the other temporal: and their joint effect scarcely produces the sensation of an interval between the bestowals of the bread and the cup; both bestowals appear to have been made at the close of the meal.

The four Accounts can hardly present more than a handful out of the long and intimate converse of that fateful evening. It was fitting that words of especially vital significance should be recorded alone, so that their cogency might not compel us less, from close association with other of the Lord's farewell teaching. The narratives of the Synoptists gain in penetrative power by their concentrated form: they resemble the cut gem, which fascinates the eye, and scores a mark on the hardest material. The fourth Gospel records all those tender words which might have been expected to come from the Lord to His "little flock" even at a time when any but absolute purity of soul would have snapped beneath the cruel stress. The last Gospel here as elsewhere supplements the other three; the latter possess none of the diffuse garrulity of an old man's memory, which some critics have charged to S. John's account, forgetting that every one of his verses is by itself pregnant with truth. If brevity is a hallmark of truth, the Synoptists may claim to satisfy this test in their accounts of the Institution; and their aim seems to have been none other than the conveyance of saving truths in the simplest and shortest way.

Considerations of this sort we believe to be no less helpful than the discussion of textual details, as steps towards a freer and fuller confidence in the Accounts, especially where they overlap without mutual contradiction, and where there is no reason to suspect interpolation. The actual words

[1] Compare also the Pauline mode of referring to the betrayal in the imperfect, *παρεδίδετο*: 1 Co 11[23].

of the Lord on the redemptive efficacy of His Death, and concurrently of His Body and Blood, may be fairly taken to be found by addition of the four Accounts, accepting each factor and rejecting none. The Mc-Mt account connects the Self-sacrifice of the Cross with the shedding of the Blood in the cup: the Lc-Pl narrative associates it with the surrendering of the Body in the bread; may not the Lord have joined it with both and stated it twice?—S. Luke with characteristic symmetry does report it twice: ΤΟ ϹΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ, ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΟΝ: [ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ,] ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΚΧΥΝΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ. Thus there may be assumed a certain abridgement in Mc, Mt and Pl: they were content, it would seem, to express once with unmistakable emphasis the redemptive word.

Take again the words of the Lord: ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗϹΙΝ, recorded twice by S. Paul, once by S. Luke, and not at all by SS. Mark and Matthew. The four writers can scarcely have been aware that a comparison of their brief narratives, made eighteen centuries after their time, would throw into prominence differences of content which would be considered, in all sobriety, to overthrow the tradition of ages that the Eucharist was instituted by Christ Himself. The narratives were approved by the Church, when she sealed the canon of the New Testament, and all the while was commending herself to the conscience in her dispensation of these heavenly Mysteries. In the twentieth century, to conclude from a few Evangelical variations, accompanied by no essential inconsistencies, that the Church some time in the second century of grace fell into so grievous an error, never suspected, surmised or imagined until yesterday, borders upon the absurd. Such rationalistic scepticism differs lamentably from rational criticism.

In the face of those who urge "with all reserve and reverence" the Pauline origin of the Eucharist[1], a few general considerations may be brought forward. The difficulty does not lie in the evidence, but in the way in which the evidence is approached. The interpretation of history is idle and barren, there is no lesson to be learned or counsel to be gained, if the hand of God is not seen in it, whether it be the working of a Providence so-called, or with greater precision the purpose of the Father, the energy of the Son, and the illumination of the Holy Spirit which are everywhere discerned. The canon of continuity in development, the principle of the applicability of critical

[1] *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, P. Gardner, 1893: compare *Die urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls*, F. Spitta, 1893.

methods, the presumption that present minds applied to records of past action will produce anything but manifold delusion,—all these postulates remain in the realm of postulate unless they are embraced in the full and complete recognition of God, corresponding in this instance to the general guidance of the Church by the Holy Spirit of Truth. How is it credible, then, that for a century and a half, to mention only the period before us, from the foundation of the Church to the close of the second century, the whole body of Christians should understand, and understand wrongly, that a supreme mystical Gift had been given to them, as it were bequeathed to them, by their Saviour on the last night of His earthly ministry? Yet more, that they should believe, and believe wrongly, that He ordered them to repeat the simple acts of the Supper held on that evening of His betrayal? Nothing but an impressive mass of evidence can justify any critic in adopting so precarious a position; and this constraining mass of evidence is not forthcoming.

To return from this apologetic digression, one more divergence between Mc-Mt and Lc-Pl has not yet been mentioned. The opening words over the cup are variously reported. In Mc-Mt the cup is the Lord's Blood of the Covenant; in Lc-Pl it is the New Covenant in His Blood. Since the Covenant of the former is not the old Mosaic Covenant, the epithet "new" of the latter is not unnatural, and so the distinction mainly resides in the contrast: "Blood of Covenant," and "Covenant in Blood." It appears that no contrast was intended by the writers. In Lc follow the words: "which is being poured out on your behalf"; so that the cup, to which the clause refers, must contain the Blood; and in Pl a little earlier are the words: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not fellowship in the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not fellowship in the Body of Christ?" The relation of the bread to the Body is the same as of the cup to the Blood; and thus in Pl and Lc the cup is stated, in a slightly different way from that in Mc and Mt, to be the Lord's Blood sealing the (New) Covenant then being made by Him.

On the whole, therefore, nothing essential in the recorded words of the Institution according to any one of the six Accounts can be considered to arise out of a mistake or to have been added without warrant. The Lord may be unhesitatingly conceived to have presented to His Disciples, first the bread, with such simple words as:

"Take this and eat it: THIS IS MY BODY: which is given for you: do this for My remembrance";

second, the cup of wine, with words not very different from:

"Take this and all drink it: THIS IS MY BLOOD: which is shed for you and many, to make a new covenant for remission of sins: do this for My remembrance."

The acts of taking, giving thanks and blessing, breaking, distributing, will be noticed later; here it may suffice to suggest the peculiar importance they receive from their very mention in so brief a narrative.

After close scrutiny of what are, after all, but textual minutiae, the perspective needs to be restored. In the last decade a wave of scepticism burst over what had seemed through eighteen centuries to be indisputable undisputed fact. The very objectivity of the Institution as an historical event was doubted more than once,—a phase of thought peculiarly modern. Discrepancies of narration were taken to signify deception, conscious or unconscious, early or late, direct or indirect. And yet the detection of discrepancies results from the profusion of evidence. With no more than one extant record, the most powerful weapon of destructive criticism is made useless. In a store of really reliable, independent, personal evidence, discrepancies are visible to the naked eye. It is in the manufactured article that the veneer of plausibility lulls the attention by smooth deceit.

THE PREPARATION FOR THE EUCHARIST

A cursory perusal of the records of the acts and words of the Lord in the Last Supper is sufficient to recall similar acts and cognate words described by all the Gospels in connexion with the previous life of Christ and with His succeeding visits after His Resurrection. The taking and breaking of loaves of bread, the blessing or thanksgiving, and the distribution are familiar and characteristic events outside the Last Supper; they at once recall the feeding of the multitudes. And the words of eating His Body and drinking His Blood had their forerunners in earlier discourses recorded by S. John, of which the relationship to the Eucharist is so intimate that some have seen in them more than in the records of the Last Supper.

The feeding of the five thousand is recorded in all four Gospels; that of the four thousand in the first two only. The Marcan narratives will be found in the texts printed above; and with them may be compared the Lucan passage describing the evening-meal at Emmaus and the Johannine account of the morning-meal on the shore of Gennesaret, both referring to the risen life of the Lord.

All these extracts depict vividly the Lord's manner of presiding at a meal. He is pourtrayed as taking bread, giving thanks or blessing[1], breaking and bestowing, before those about Him begin to eat. The outward procedure on each occasion was very similar to that of the Last Supper. In the acts of that Meal there can have been little that was novel or strange; they were in accordance with an habitual practice, so characteristic and so significant as to deserve and secure permanent record. Their inimitable graciousness led to His recognition when the fashion of His bodily frame was changed, and the two disciples knew Him "in the breaking of the bread."

The occurrence of ὁμοίως in Jn 21 is of interest because of the attention which was focussed upon ὡσαύτως in the Lc-Pl Accounts of the Institution. A further point may be noted: the act of fraction is not mentioned in either Johannine excerpt. But in the first case the Marcan tradition embodied in all the synoptic Gospels records the breaking, and this may be confidently accepted. Then the omission in the second case on the part of S. John becomes less surprising, and the fourth Evangelist's silence on the matter need not be considered to impugn the view that the Lord's procedure alike at public and private meals was uniform, the same as in their ἀνακεφαλαίωσις at the Last Supper.

It cannot be of only trivial interest to consider whether the Lord's manner of beginning a meal does not contain elements deeper than the merely picturesque. Otherwise it is hard to imagine why it should procure for itself such repeated and detailed insertion into brief records of Christ's life, composed for the furtherance of the salvation of mankind. Is, then, superficial interest or pictorial aim the only factor in the specification of such details as these of breaking, and blessing, and distributing? Or, are they not glimpses of sacramental truth, pervading all bodily life and centring in the Incarnation? For those who are in the body, bodily acts have a spiritual import and

[1] The Accounts of the Institution show that εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν are almost interchangeable words: see also 1 Co 14^{16}, and compare 1 Co 11^{24} with 1 Co 10^{16}.

counterpart. The Religion of the Incarnation has promises for, and demands from, both body and spirit, disclosed in and by One who was perfect Man and perfect God.

To his short sketch of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand S. John appends a train of discourses arising therefrom. An inestimable debt of gratitude is due to the Evangelist for his preservation of at least the substance and trend of the Lord's instruction. In the face of his own declaration of the utter impossibility of producing a full account of all the words and deeds of the Lord, the debt is ill repaid by the critic who on these very grounds impugns his witness, and condemns as untrustworthy an epitome of unparalleled vigour and depth.

The salient passages of the Sixth Chapter have been transcribed among the textual materials, and they amount briefly to this. JESUS led His people's thoughts from earthly to heavenly food. He declares Himself to be their life-giving Bread and never-failing Drink. But how? In a strange and aweful sense. The true Bread is His Flesh which He will give for the life of the world, and the true Drink is His Blood. Whoever lives by these shall never die, but have eternal life.

There is here a promise, fulfilled at the close of the Lord's earthly Ministry, realised in very deed at the Last Supper. Then and not until then did the Apostles receive the fruition of the promised Gift, and through them an agelong Stewardship was bestowed on the Church.

Beyond those resulting from a perverse will, no limits are set to the scope of the eternal benefits which the Lord will give to mankind. The range of His promise is as wide as that of the Gracious Invitation. The Discourse foreshadows the Eucharist, but it is general while the latter is specific. The Discourse is inclusive, the Eucharist is exclusive. The words recorded by S. John were addressed to the world: the Eucharist was entrusted to the Church. The world was promised eternal life, and receives it, but through the Church.

Stress has sometimes been laid upon the statement: *τὰ ῥήματα ἃ Ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωή ἐστιν*, because it would appear to enforce upon the discourse a "spiritual" sense. In this use of the word "spiritual" the precise meaning desired to be attached is rarely clear. A materialistic interpretation of the Lord's words could not be more revolting to the modern mind than it was to the Jewish taste. It may be sufficient to

point out the danger which "spirituality" incurs, of falling into excessive idealism and sublimating vital truths into the intangible and ineffable. The *via media*, which frankly acknowledges, with the paramount claims of the spirit, the far from negligible claims of the body, accords with the sacramental view of life to which contemplation of the Incarnation leads.

The keynote of this Sixth Chapter is that the Lord's Flesh and Blood shall be given for the eternal life of those who eat and drink them. Hard and obscure at this stage, the teaching became easy and luminous in the Last Supper. At the Institution, the how, the when and the where of the bestowal of the spiritual Food were made known. The dispensation of the Food was entrusted to the Apostles: the same Food, for to the generic Σάρξ the specific Σῶμα corresponds. The Gifts thus contained in the earthen vessels ordained by the Lord were bequeathed by the Apostles to the care of others who succeeded them, and so, in an unbroken chain, the Catholic Church retained, and still retains, the stewardship of the Means of Grace, the Food which "preserves unto everlasting life."

The Institution of the Eucharist not only fully realises but exceeds and transcends the expectations aroused by this Discourse a year before. Therein is initiated the New Covenant. The Last Supper is the occasion of the formal bestowal of the benefits of the Lord's Death upon the Apostles and the many. It is then that He formally surrenders His Life for their life, anticipating Calvary. That infinite and eternal Sacrifice is to be ever commemorated thenceforward by the Apostles and by the corporate Body which they primarily constitute. The repetition of the Last Supper is to bind afresh the Covenant that will not be loosed, to supplicate the continued conferment of the benefits of the Cross which will not be taken away, to receive the gracious gifts of living Food which will not fail, to recall the memory of Calvary which will not fade.

THE EUCHARIST IN THE PAULINE CHURCHES

The case of the Corinthian Church, to which the attention first directs itself in the essay to discover the mode of reproducing the Last Supper in Apostolic times, is pathological. The first Epistle from its founder to this Church is practically a congeries of disciplinary regulations and adjustments

and suggestions. Sound doctrine is inculcated, indeed, but almost medicinally, if the expression may be used; mainly it is the outward and ecclesiastical which needs authoritative settlement, though these derangements are themselves largely due to neglect of the inward and religious. To the mind of the Apostle, which in essentials he himself considers to represent the mind of Christ, the importance of the relationship, social and otherwise, of Christians to one another, and to the world, is by no means small. At Corinth there is supreme need for disciplinary organisation, the failure of which has led to abuses and evils often of a terrible character. The community has its rights no less than the individual; "a man should seek not his own but others' good": the achievement of personal salvation should be but a part of the aim of every true follower of Christ.

The outward corporate life of the Christian community at Corinth centres about the Lord's Supper, which is the occasion of frequent assemblages of the Brethren. The Service has already gained its specific title: *τὸ Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*, closely analogous to: *ἡ Κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*. Indeed it will be seen that it was customary to celebrate the Lord's Supper on the Lord's Day.

The fundamental elements of the Service, in solemnity and significance, were the giving of thanks, the blessing and breaking of the cake of bread, the blessing of the cup of wine, and the recital of the Lord's own words preceding His injunction to "do this for His remembrance." Of the consecrated food and drink those present partook in common. This was the Lord's Supper *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; but it would appear to have been "enshrined" in a social meal (Gemeindemahl), a common table shared by all, to which the well-to-do contributed more than those who were not so well-off. This apparently innocent and desirable manifestation of brotherhood led to the disgracing and defaming of the Lord's Supper, in the manner described by S. Paul. It may be that until the experience of the Church displayed the sad truth, there seemed little reason why the Supper should not be a bodily as well as a spiritual meal. The Institution was such a combination. Pentecost was followed by the daily participation in such common meals at Jerusalem, in which bread was broken and fellowship renewed. The burning enthusiasm of the ensuing generation maintained, it may be, an ideal Service in which the appetite of the body did not hamper or frustrate the claims of the spirit. But in process of time, as the Church gathered in, like a great drag-net, all sorts and conditions of men, the danger of the profanation of the Body and

Blood of the Lord made itself apparent, and was too terrible a risk to be suffered to continue. Thus the Lord's Supper, to the augmentation of its power and to the maintenance of its integrity, became a meal in which the nourishment of the soul was the exclusive aim. As the Apostle says more than once in the Epistle: Πάντα ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. The Church was not called into existence to feed men's bodies but their souls; or, at the least, the latter have the paramount claim.

Although S. Paul insists upon the differentiation of function among the members of the Body, his purpose is rather to inculcate mutual tolerance than to enforce the lessons of the Epistle from the sister Church at Rome written by S. Clement some forty years later. The Service was held ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, and thanksgiving formed a prominent feature; but it is not clear that this was yet entrusted to a few officers, as came to be the case at the close of the first century. At all events, if one of the brothers were charged with the solemn task, the rest of the brotherhood became laymen with respect to him during the Service, and answered "Amen" to his εὐλογία or εὐχαριστία[1]. No completely prescribed form of words was used. The language of the president was even not always intelligible to others; and herein were the seeds of a freedom detrimental to the edification of the Church.

There are no signs of a regular assemblage for any purpose besides the celebrations of the Lord's Supper, and the rules for public worship laid down by the Apostle are completely applicable to such Services. Singing, preaching, prayer were doubtless features of the liturgy, and in these S. Paul encourages a hearty emulation but sternly reproves jealous rivalry. His last word is the monition echoed by S. Clement: Πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω. The salutation ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ may fairly refer to the greeting at the Lord's Supper which was afterwards almost universal; and it requires no stretch of fancy to see in the words Εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν Κύριον, ἤτω ἀνάθεμα and Μαρὰν ἀθά fragments of current liturgical forms.

An examination of those aspects of the Lord's Supper which are distinctly seen in the Epistle may lead to the discovery of no more than a portion of the whole truth, but the information so gained must command great respect from the earliness of the evidence and the rank of the writer.

The disciplinary aspect is most evident of all. The bread and the cup are the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, and any professed adherent

[1] For the sense of ἰδιώτης see 2 Co 11^6. In 1 Co $14^{23, 24}$ the meaning is rather, "uninitiated."

of the Church, who has committed gross sin and continues impenitent, must be debarred from joining in the Meal: he must be excommunicated. "Cast out the evil one from yourselves," is S. Paul's unflinching ordinance; the further judgement of the sinner may then be left to God. The mystical union in Christ is coordinated with the outward unanimity displayed in partaking of one bread and one cup. This unity must not be endangered or impaired by any lax participation in similar but pagan bonds of union. Communion with Christ is not compatible with communion with devils. And it is not consistent with dissensions and divisions within the Body.

Besides being the bond of internal and external unity, of union with Christ through the Church, the Lord's Supper is declared by S. Paul to be a Sacrament. What is signified by this technical term of later days is the subject of a passage in the Epistle. The Apostle adopts the Lord's figure of the manna which sustained the bodies of the Israelites in the wilderness, and adds to it the riven rock which allayed their physical thirst. In this Divinely bestowed nourishment "after the flesh," S. Paul sees the types of the *πνευματικὸν βρῶμα* and *πνευματικὸν πόμα*, the Body and Blood of Christ linked to the "bread which we break" and the "cup of blessing which we bless."

According to S. Paul, the Lord's Supper is by the Lord's command a memorial of Himself giving His Body on behalf of others and sealing a new Covenant in His Blood: every celebration of the Sacrament of Blessing is a proclamation of these eternal and saving facts.

The continual occurrence of *εὐχαριστία* (or *εὐχαριστεῖν*) and its equivalent *εὐλογία* in direct connexion with the Supper shows that the Service is an Eucharist in the etymological sense of the word[1], an act of thanksgiving for creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life, but above all for redemption in Christ JESUS. The general adoption of the name "Eucharist" witnesses to the prominence of thanksgiving in a Service richly endowed with titles—the Breaking of Bread, the Lord's Supper, the Holy Communion, the Blessed Sacrament.

The abuse of the Body and Blood of the Lord by those who partake without discernment is fraught with the gravest peril. Preliminary self-

[1] A manuscript note of Dr Hort's, published in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. iii, points out that the word *εὐχαριστία* is "unknown to LXX in all senses; as it is also to the Apocrypha as applied to sacrifices, even in Sir. xxxii 1—9 where it might have been expected."

examination, therefore, cannot be dispensed with; and the recipient must discern the presence of the Body and Blood, or he will sin against them. This discrimination belongs to ὁ πνευματικός, who will discriminate τὰ πνευματικά. The penalty of irreverence might and did fall upon the offender in this life; S. Paul deliberately attributes bodily weakness, sickness and death, on a large scale, to the abuse of the Lord's Supper. The converse truth is not stated in the Epistle, that in the reception of the sacramental Food the body benefits as well as the soul, so that both are "preserved unto everlasting life." The conviction of this truth is seen in Ignatius and Irenaeus. The sacramental view of the world correlates in many ways spiritual and physical goods and evils.

There does not appear to have been a general fund for charitable purposes to which contributions were made actually at celebrations of the Lord's Supper; each saves for himself, and so is able to bring forward a lump sum when the occasion arrives.

The next piece of canonical witness, in point of fulness and precision, occurs in the sequel to S. Luke's Gospel. It refers to the usage of the Christian community at Troas, a Pauline Church; and in the narrative S. Paul is the most prominent personage, while S. Luke is an eye-witness.

At the close of the week spent by the Apostle at Troas, on the Sunday, SS. Paul and Luke proceeded to an evening Service for the breaking of bread. The place was an upper room, and the scene is vividly depicted and the action graphically described,—the many lamps, the prolonged discourse, the drowsy boy, his alarming fall, the abrupt close of the Apostle's sermon, the picking-up of the limp body, the promptitude of the preacher, the anxiety of the congregation, the Apostle's tender solicitude[1], the relief of the assembly at the lad's revival. The Service being resumed, S. Paul broke the bread, and ate of it.

Was this a Lord's Supper?—The practice of the Corinthian community was ordained in all Pauline Churches; and the assemblage, the evening-meal[2], the breaking of the bread, are all points of identification. The day was a solemn one, regarded very soon afterwards as the proper day for celebrations of the Supper: so Pliny's Letter, the Didache, and Justin's

[1] Ὁ Παῦλος ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ συνπεριλαβὼν εἶπεν· Μὴ θορυβεῖσθε, Ac 20^{10}.

[2] Γευσάμενος implies more than "tasted," we suppose.

Apology testify. The set discourse, implied by διαλέγεσθαι in contrast with ὁμιλεῖν, is also a feature of celebrations at a time when they come to be more fully described. Despite the slenderness of the threads, there need be little hesitancy in making an affirmative reply to the question[1]; and it may be taken that at Troas in the decade 50—60 A.D. the Lord's Supper was celebrated on the Sunday, in the evening, and called ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, the Breaking of the Bread.

In the light of this a step backward may be taken to Pentecostal days. S. Luke describes the life of the first converts at Jerusalem after the reception of the Paraclete by the Apostles as one of simplicity and gladness, in which the breaking of the bread was a regular and prominent feature, a part of their daily observance, and a witness to their fellowship. Now at Corinth not a generation later this κοινωνία was sealed by joint participation in the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup at the Lord's Supper, to which the phrase ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου was applied at Troas. The Lord's Supper was a solemn rite worthy to be ranked with worship in the Temple, and would correspond to the latter as the new to the old in the devotions of Christians. Still further, the Latin Text of Codex Bezae has: et communicatione fractionis panis; and the Peshitto reads: in the breaking of the Eucharist. Both versions witness to an early conviction that "the breaking of the bread" bore reference to the fulfilment of the Lord's historical command to repeat the Last Supper for His remembrance. The command was not so quickly forgotten.

It may be regarded as certain, therefore, that the second chapter of Acts closes with a reference to frequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper at Jerusalem about 30 A.D. But the precise degree of their relationship to a common meal, if such there were, eludes the grasp in the paucity of evidence. Later Corinthian and Troadian usage might suggest a social meal, to which each contributed his share, at some stage of which a cake of bread and a cup of wine were set apart for blessing and distribution. There may have been much individual initiative in the conduct of the Service: of set formulae and ordained officials there might be few in those early days. To us, all is speculation until the middle of the first century, except for a few general facts and principles.

[1] Professor Knowling mentions that the Peshitto renders κλάσαι ἄρτον (Ac 20^{7}) by "to break the Eucharist": *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1900: Vol. ii. *ad locum*. So also at Ac 2^{42}.

As in the lower stages of organic development the functions of the organism are performed by any and every part, so the Church of Christ was at the first a comparatively homogeneous body. In process of development, the organism becomes more and more differentiated; this member performs this office and that organ has that function. Similarly the Church gradually and irrevocably became articulate, in obedience to those inward vital impulses wherein might be felt rather than seen the moulding activity of the Holy Spirit, shaping the Church towards its ideal and predestined form.

One more passage of Acts may be mentioned, describing how S. Paul, in critical peril on board ship off Malta, cheered the crew by eating bread before them. In his "β-text," Dr Blass inserts after ἐσθίειν the words: ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ ἡμῖν, on somewhat small evidence, suggesting a celebration of the Lord's Supper. Whether this be so or not, the circumstances were exceptional, and the only valuable inference to be made, were it certainly a celebration which is narrated, would perhaps be a testimony to the power of the Eucharist for consolation and fortification in times of extreme exhaustion and peril.

Other references to the Lord's Supper may be surmised in various parts of the Epistles of S. Paul. For instance, in the exhortation: τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν, it may be that εὐχαριστία, enclosed between προσευχή and προσεύχεσθαι, implies the corporate expression of thanks such as was from the first associated with the Eucharist.

In conclusion the order of celebration of the Eucharist in the Pauline Churches of the latter half of the first century may have been very approximately as follows:

Weekly, in the evening, the Christian community, men and women, assembled, and partook of a common meal, the primary outward aim of which was not the satisfaction of appetite and the expression of goodwill, but the commemoration of their Saviour. A discourse might precede; then thanks were offered reverently by one of those present; in the thanksgiving familiar short formulae might be incorporated; at the close all answered, Amen. The president stood to bless and break the bread, and to pour the wine. These were then reverently partaken of by the congregation. The kiss of peace may have been exchanged at some stage of the Service.

THE EUCHARIST IN THE SUB-APOSTOLIC WRITINGS

§ 1. The Epistle of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians

S. Clement, Bishop of Rome at the end of the first century, is an early witness to the stability of the organisation of the Church, and to the estimate of the Eucharist which obtained at a time when the last Apostle was near his death. The only extant writing of his is the Epistle of the Roman Church to the Corinthian Church, of which the occasion is unhappily similar to that of the first Pauline Epistle more than a generation earlier. The Epistle is not controversial: S. Clement in the name of his Church simply takes the Corinthians to task for their lawlessness and disorderliness. They had unwarrantably deposed certain presbyters, an act of wrong which the writer confidently assumes that the Corinthian community will recognise and redress. The writer sinks his personality and speaks only as the mouthpiece of a sister Church, already distinguished by that orderliness and regularity for which she has been famous ever since.

Of the second extract, reprinted above, the keynote is: Πάντα τάξει. Under the Old Covenant offerings and ministrations were made and performed in a careful and orderly manner at appointed times. Different offerings and services were entrusted to different officials. The High Priest had his office, the Priests had their prescribed station, the Levites had their special ministrations; and "the layman was bound by the lay ordinances."

The third passage continues the argument of the first, and gives it its application. Every one should give thanks to God in his own degree, without transgression of the defined rule of his service. The various sacrifices of the Old Testament were not offered everywhere, but only at Jerusalem, and even there in one place only; and moreover the sacrifice was inspected for blemish before it might be offered. Christians, under the New Covenant, have greater knowledge and greater responsibility.

The first and last passages cited are examples of the lofty language to which S. Clement rises in a natural and effortless way: they are two

examples only out of a great number which might be selected almost at random. The first quotes the Trisagion, heard by Isaiah, as sung by the heavenly choir: so we also, assembling in harmony for the same service of praise, ought from one mouth to pray our God that we may be made "partakers of His great and glorious promises." The last passage is a benediction of singular beauty and dignity, with which the Epistle proper closes.

Such is the sense of the four excerpts; their bearing upon the Eucharist remains to be considered. The second and third are concerned with public worship, the corporate thanksgiving to God, in which the Christian offerings and sacrifices are made. The New Testament has its sacrifices as well as the Old, and on this analogy S. Clement bases the advice on Church organisation and Church discipline. There begins to be shadowed forth a Church outside which there is no evidence of genuine Christianity, and an Eucharist outside which there is no evidence of genuine Worship. Confirmation of the attitude and tone of the Epistle relative to these matters will be discovered in nearly every passage hereafter to be cited from Ignatius down to Irenaeus.

The Eucharist is offered by all at Rome, but all have not the same office to fulfil. Some take the lead in celebrations, presbyters endowed with a ministry not to be snatched from them at the caprice of the congregation for whom they serve; the rest, the laymen, follow in due and orderly manner. The Corinthians will do well to follow this orderliness pleasing to God. The Eucharist is no haphazard occasion of thankful feelings, to be celebrated here or there, any time or anyhow, in any careless or perfunctory manner. The sacrifices of the Old Testament were sacred and solemn undertakings: in the New Testament is a Sacrifice more sacred and solemn than they; if they were offered with reverent obedience to Divine ordinance, how much more this.

The presbyters have, doubtless, other duties to perform at Rome and Corinth beside the celebration of the Christian Sacrifice, though S. Clement suggests none more important. The precise nature of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist cannot be discussed until the coordination of witness is attempted. At present it must suffice to point out S. Clement's testimony that in whatever way the Eucharist is a Christian Sacrifice.

Proper time, proper place, proper persons,—all these formalities suggest

proper forms of Service. The Epistle contains no explicit reference to liturgical forms, but S. Clement's language, never failing in a lofty grace, rises more than once or twice in the closing chapters to such a sublime height of spiritual eloquence, that if it were not the recollection of liturgical prayers and praises, it must surely have been soon adopted for that purpose by some of the officers of the Corinthian Church. The first extract is one of the most wonderful of these splendid utterances. The Trisagion may well have been one of the earliest "gems of purest ray serene" adopted for permanent use in the Eucharistic Service. The Clementine Liturgy has it, in a form little altered:

Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ·
Πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης Αὐτοῦ·
Εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

S. Clement implies that it was used in a Service of common praise, than which no other is known to have been held except the Eucharist. The fourth and last extract[1] is a blessing such as would be used in dismissing the congregation at the close of an Eucharist.

§ 2. The Epistles of S. Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr

The extant writings of S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, are seven Epistles which are the residue after a thorough sifting by Bishop Lightfoot of the literature loosely attributed to the Martyr-Bishop. The five Epistles from which extracts have been printed above for use in the present Essay are universally acknowledged to be genuine copies of letters, written at the close of the first decade of the second century, by Ignatius whilst actually on his way through Asia to undergo martyrdom at Rome. The first three quoted were written from Smyrna, and the last two shortly afterwards from Troas.

[1] Many other examples of possibly liturgical language might be given: for instance, 20, 29^{1} *ἁμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες*, 33^{4} *ταῖς ἱεραῖς καὶ ἀμώμοις χερσίν*, 35, 38^{4} *ταῦτα οὖν πάντα ἐξ Αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες ὀφείλομεν κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν Αὐτῷ· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν*, 43^{6}, 50^{7}, 58^{2}, 59—61, 65^{2}. Space forbids to enter into an analysis of them. It may be added with regard to the early "Clementine" Homily that the thankfulness, which has its corporate expression in the Eucharist, is considered by the preacher to be one of the principal traits of the Christian character: 18 *καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν γενώμεθα ἐκ τῶν εὐχαριστούντων, τῶν δεδουλευκότων τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ μὴ ἐκ τῶν κρινομένων ἀσεβῶν*. The sermon ends with a doxology, and may have been read at a celebration of the Eucharist.

The writer throws the whole weight of his personality, episcopal office, and approaching martyr's death, into the scales on the side of *ἀσφάλεια* and *βεβαίωσις*. With a confidence in the possession of the truth which leads him into the boldest language, he urges the vital and inseverable connexion between faith and life, doctrine and discipline, a connexion as intimate as that of mind and body in the economy of man. The Church, with its Baptism and its Eucharist and its common life, stayed by Bishops and Priests and Deacons, built on the foundation of the Apostles, JESUS Christ Himself the corner-stone,—such is the framework of Christian life on earth to Ignatius.

The letters of Ignatius do not defy analysis in any sense, but analysis is no great help to their better understanding. Like the character of the Saint, his utterances are passionate and mystical. His glowing enthusiasm extends to every part of the spiritual welfare of mankind. His dying ambition is to advance a little further the salvation of the individual Soul and the consummation of the collective Church.

The points of the extracts may be shortly suggested as follows:

a. "Those outside the Church lack the Divine bread." The main reference here is to the nutritive aspect of the Eucharist as food for the spirit. The sacrificial implication of *θυσιαστήριον* is not pressed, for in dealing with the sacrificial aspect language possibly metaphorical is best set aside.

b. "Assemble more frequently for thanksgiving and praise to God." It is hardly likely that *εὐχαριστία Θεοῦ* can mean anything but the Eucharistic Service of the Lord's Supper[1]. Compare with this the injunctions in Magn. 4.

c. The broken "bread-cake" of the Eucharist is the token and bond of unity; furthermore, it cures the sickness of the sinful soul, by imparting to it eternal life in JESUS Christ.

d. The Church with its organisation of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, is the abode of the pure in heart.

e. "Recruit yourselves in faith and love, the very Flesh and Blood of JESUS Christ." This is one of Ignatius' fearless metaphors which he does

[1] Dr Plummer, in his article on "Lord's Supper" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, considers that *εὐχαριστία* has here no specific sense, but implies no more than general giving of thanks to God. We have ventured to differ from his decision.

not scruple to employ in addressing Churchmen thoroughly familiar with Eucharistic practice and Eucharistic doctrine.

f. "I would eat the Divine bread which is Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood, which is incorruptible love." Here, as elsewhere, it hardly needs mention that theological analysis is far from Ignatius' thoughts. He writes in perfect freedom with confidence of a sympathetic hearing which would ensure his not being misunderstood.

g. An emphatic assertion of the oneness and oneliness of the Church and the Sacrament. There is one Food, one Shrine, one Bishop with his Presbytery and Diaconate. To act in accordance with this Dispensation is to act *κατὰ Θεόν.*

h. Men stay away from the Eucharist because they do not believe it to be the Flesh of Christ, the same which suffered and was raised. The word Eucharist is used in two technical senses; the second highly technical, because it denotes the consecrated elements. The second usage will be seen to be quite established in Justin's day.

k. Let the Eucharist be celebrated only with the authority of the Bishop or his Vicar. Apart from him also Baptism is not valid, nor holding of love-feasts.

To sum up the several heads, the Service designated Eucharist by Ignatius and forming the centre of Church life has to do with the eating and drinking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, the former identified with broken bread; the Eucharist of Syria, Asia, and Italy is therefore the Lord's Supper of the days of S. Paul, and the Breaking of Bread of Pentecostal times.

It is not necessary to draw out a sequence of deductions from the nine extracts briefly commented upon; they speak for themselves; and their fervour puts criticism out of court. The last three are most significant, and the technical uses of *εὐχαριστία* already noted, along with the Johannine touch in the substitution of *σάρξ* for *σῶμα,* are especially noteworthy. A few general remarks may, however, be not altogether out of place.

To Ignatius' mind unsound doctrine leads to unsound conduct; and his view may be considered to have been justified in the history of the Catholic Church, which was compelled to define and describe the Way of Life. At the opening of the second century there were already some to deny that the bread and cup were the Flesh and Blood of Christ; and there were

those who forgot that these sacred Gifts might not be dispensed except by the Church as organised by the Apostles. Ignatius strenuously repudiates these errors of belief and practice. He sees in the Eucharist, with its one bread which is the Flesh of Christ, the true and only bond of union, the true and only food for the soul. The proper and valid celebration of this sacred Feast is of the utmost importance: thereby the powers of evil are overcome. The heavenly Food belongs only to those within the shrine: it is a boon to the pure in heart. The sacrifice which seems implied in *θυσιαστήριον* repeated three or four times is not defined; nor again is the memorial aspect of the Eucharist brought forward. The thanksgiving aspect is everywhere present, latent in the name itself.

But it must not be forgotten that these farewell letters are not balanced discourses on aspects of the Eucharist. They are the desperately earnest exhortations of a Martyr-Bishop full of the conviction expressed by the Apostle whose influence he has felt: *Παιδία, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν.* What may be learned from them about the Eucharist is in a considerable degree that which at the hour needed re-enforcement. What the Churches did not forget, S. Ignatius did not need to tell them of.

§ 3. The Letter of Pliny to Trajan

This letter, written by the Governor of Bithynia to the Emperor of Rome early in the second century[1], contains an account, derived by the former from two deaconesses, of the two occasions on which Christian communities regularly assembled together, for religious and social purposes, in the northern part of the Asiatic peninsula.

Bishop Lightfoot's notes on the passage concerned may be summarised thus: *stato die*, Sunday: *carmen*, set form of words: *invicem*, antiphonally: *sacramento*, an oath like the military one: *rursus*, later in the day: *ad capiendum cibum*, the meal was discontinued in accordance with the imperial edict against clubs.

It is beyond doubt that a solemn Service for which Christians assembled on a fixed day, before dawn, for worship of Christ and for that only, and at which they pledged themselves in God's sight to purity of life,—it is beyond reasonable doubt that this is the Eucharist.

[1] Trajan reigned 98—117 A.D. See Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, *Ignatius*, Vol. i. p. 50.

The social meal in the evening may be the agape. If so, it is distinct from the Eucharist. The two are mentioned as distinct services by Ignatius, so we think, in his Epistle to the Smyrnaeans. There appears little reason for connecting the two at the beginning of the second century.

§ 4. The Epistle of the Smyrnaeans on the Martyrdom of Polycarp

The martyrdom of the Bishop of Smyrna who was a younger friend of Ignatius is assigned by Bishop Lightfoot in his great edition of the Apostolic Fathers to the year 155. The passage printed among our materials for its liturgical form comes from the kernel of the narrative, and cannot be much later than the event described.

The lofty language suggests reminiscences of corporate worship, and though the words: *ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Σου εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος*, relate to the cup of suffering which the Lord drank to its dregs, yet it is notable that apart from their context they should apply with exact propriety to the cup of the Eucharist; and the salvation of soul and body is implied, which Irenaeus considers to be secured by the sacramental efficacy of the Eucharist. It is more pertinent to observe the grouping of epithets in that rhythm of surpassing beauty which characterises the great Liturgies of the Church: of this, *ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός*, and *περὶ πάντων Σὲ αἰνῶ, Σὲ εὐλογῶ, Σὲ δοξάζω διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου καὶ ἐπουρανίου* Ἀρχιερέως ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ, are two examples only. These beautiful coronals of words suggest the use of crystallised forms in the Services of the Smyrnaean Church; and if the evidence is slight, it is worth while to have inspected them[1].

§ 5. The Epitaph of Avircius

This inscription, composed by a Phrygian Bishop of the second century, during his lifetime, conducts to the haunt of early dissenting revivals.

Dr Ramsay points out the esoteric and exoteric sides of this biography:

[1] The prayer recalls the Eucharistic sections of the Didache, especially in the case of the following characteristic words: *παντοκράτωρ, παῖς, πατήρ, ἐπίγνωσις, κτίσις, εὐλογεῖν, ζωή, αἰώνιος*. A comparison with the Clementine Liturgy would be interesting.

its terms would be clear to the Christian, but entirely enigmatical to the Pagan[1]. To the latter the "elect city" is Hieropolis, to the former the New Jerusalem. The King and Queen whom Avircius beheld at Rome appear to be the State and the Church, represented by the Emperor and the Roman Church. The "bright seal" recalls several passages of the Apocalypse: the idea occurs more than once in the early "Clementine" Homily. Finally, the follower of S. Paul describes how Faith gave ΙΧΘΥΣ to her friends for abiding food, and with bread bestowed mingled wine[2]. Bearing in mind the mystic meaning of the Fish, there is the most certain allusion to the Eucharist. He who was born of a pure Virgin is given to the faithful for daily bread.

§ 6. The Didache (Teaching of the Apostles)

The bearing of this anonymous document, of which the discovery dates back nearly twenty years, upon the primitive Eucharist is of such importance as to warrant an especially full discussion of the nature and value of its testimony. The general questions of the date, origin, and significance of the Didache will therefore be re-opened, despite the considerable mass of work which has been expended already by more competent hands than ours.

A cursory inspection of the Didache marks it a duplex composition[3], the result of affixing a manual of Christian devotion and discipline to the revision of a Jewish manual of moral instruction, called "The Two Ways." With the appearance of the latter elsewhere as an incorporated document we have not to do here; it is the distinctly Christian appendix which concerns the Eucharist. The whole work displays a Judaistic bent, and could hardly issue from minds of any but Jewish cast.

The precise locality of the origin of the Didache may be characterised in two respects from internal evidence. The permission to use warmed water at

[1] See *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Vol. ii. p. 722 et seq. The epitaph is discussed by Bp Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. i. Pt 2, p. 480 et seq.

[2] The contention of Harnack on the use of bread and water only in Eucharistic Services of the second century has met with little favour. His tractate, *Brot und Wasser: die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin*, published in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. 7, Pt 2, was formally answered by Zahn, *Brot und Wein im Abendmahl der alten Kirche*, 1892.

[3] See the elaborate edition by Dr Rendel Harris, *The Teaching of the Apostles*, London, 1887, which has been used for Appendix E.

Baptism has been thought to point to a climate at least occasionally rigorous. And further the Eucharistic prayer of peculiar beauty: "As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills and was gathered together to become one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the borders of the earth into Thy Kingdom," by its allusion to upland cornfields, has been considered to point to a source other than Egypt, for which a case could be made[1]. This conclusion is supported by the omission of the words ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων in the Egyptian recension made by the pseudo-Athanasius in De Virginitate. Despite the primitive simplicity of the Didache, its peculiarities of doctrine and ritual indicate a circulation in regions remote from the main streams of Catholic development, probably within a circle of Jewish Christian communities in some backwater of religious progress. To these considerations must be added the view which we have felt constrained to take, that the Didache was intended mainly for private use, or for a use foreshadowing that said to have been found for it by S. Athanasius, namely, the instruction of catechumens. Dr Sanday's opinion recently expressed would seem to afford the best answer to the requirements of the question of locality: The Eucharistic prayers in the Didache had their origin somewhere in Eastern Palestine (Peraea) or in Syria[2].

The end of the first century is not perhaps too early a date for the Eucharistic prayers[3]. They have a strikingly Johannine tone, and this is ascribed by Dr Sanday to the perpetuation near Jerusalem of oral teaching of S. John's, previously to and independently of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostolic Theologian. Many examples of Johannine touches have been collected by Dr Schaff, and the list may be considerably extended; in particular, the Eucharistic prayers display a train of Johannine words, phrases and concepts. Careful scrutiny of the quotations from the Gospels imbedded in the Didache gives good reason to think that whilst the first Gospel was probably in the compiler's hands, the third Gospel was not before him, and still less the second. Of six passages which at first sight seem to come from the first or third Gospels indifferently, closer examination shows that five are

[1] The analogy of the Didache has been employed in English: "All Christen men be one mysticall body of Christe, as the breadde is made of many graynes," quoted in one of Mr Vernon Staley's books.

[2] *The Pilot*, June 23, 1900.

[3] The Eucharistic discipline may conceivably be of rather later date than the prayers: it is necessary to point this out, but the whole will be assumed to belong to the beginning of the second century.

from the first and not the third, while the remaining case is inconclusive. There is no clear trace, then, of Lucan, nor of Marcan or Pauline influence[1]. The Johannine vein may be entirely due to reminiscence of oral teaching; S. Matthew's Gospel had a great prevalence in Palestine in the first century; and so the crude simplicity of the later part of the Didache, both of its theology and of its discipline, which favours its ascription to the brief era of the Christian prophets at the dividing of the first two centuries, may be allowed to assign a date almost as early as 100 A.D. to the document as a whole. In any case, it must be allowed to represent first century teaching and practice, and in so far justifies its ambitious title, *ἡ Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*.

Although there can be no doubt about the identification of the Eucharist, with which the ninth, tenth and fourteenth sections are concerned, with the Breaking of Bread and the Lord's Supper, yet the first two of these sections are concerned with thanksgiving to the exclusion of any direct reference to the Last Supper or to the Saviour's Cross or to His Body and Blood. There can be no doubt, because the broken bread and the cup are here; an accompanying or enveloping social meal is suggested; the service is on "the Lord's own day"; it is practically called the Breaking of Bread (*κλάσατε ἄρτον*, 14) as well as the Eucharist. Moreover it is a pure offering, open to the baptized faithful only, and after the discipline of self-examination or confession; it is the seal of brotherly concord.

A review of these points of divergence and convergence shows that the divergences are all of omission, and the omissions are conspicuous in the prayers of the ninth and tenth sections; the fourteenth section has nothing in it to occasion difficulty in the identification of the Service. If the omissions can be satisfactorily explained, all will be well; for to base a positive theory on them is possibly a leaning upon a hollow reed.

Probably the manual throughout presents a brief outline of that with which it professes to deal. The prayers and thanksgivings terminated by doxologies are extremely short, and few in number. Towards the close of the tenth section they become mere ejaculations: *Ὡσαννὰ τῷ Θεῷ Δανείδ... Μαρὰν ἀθά*, a perplexing phenomenon, for it seems to betoken not the end

[1] In the face of the almost certain acquaintance of the author of the Didache with the first Gospel, Harnack's suggestion that he used the Gospel according to the Egyptians is rather like insisting that a man possibly has silver in his left pocket when he almost certainly has gold in his right.

but the beginning of a very solemn Service. The brief regulations, again, are no more than memoranda; the directions are concise and scattered. Although it is a dangerous procedure, scarcely to be adopted except as a last resort, the hypothesis of reserve can hardly be avoided. Wide circulation of the manual within its domain may have made it desirable that the most sacred parts of the Service should not be put on record. Some such jealous guardianship of a pearl of great price is indicated by the adoption of the Lord's warning: Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν. To this topic a return will presently be made.

One more consideration may be recalled. The use of οὖν at the beginning of the fifteenth section, it has been remarked by editors, implies that it was for the preservation of the purity of the Eucharistic sacrifice that Bishops and Deacons were to be chosen worthy of the Lord. These with the Prophets were to superintend the offerings, and though the latter held the higher rank, they were bound by stringent regulations: such was the strength of Church discipline in the realm of the Didache.

These preliminary considerations make it practically certain that the Εὐχαριστία of the Didache is the Lord's Supper of S. Paul and the Eucharist of the Catholic Church. The main problem is now the significance of the prayers of the ninth and tenth sections, in the light of the provisional hypotheses already sketched; the passages will first be examined in greater detail.

In the ninth section, the cup precedes the bread, but the inversion loses most of its point when towards the close of the section the more usual order is encountered: μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω, κτέ. The order thus seems to have little significance for the writer, and this is more characteristic of a collection of instructions and devotions for private use than of a book of common prayer. The occurrence of ἄμπελος in the first prayer points to wine as the contents of the cup, in return for which thanks are given to the Father for the Revelation through His Servant JESUS. The bread is broken from one piece, and over it thanks are given for the manifestation of life and knowledge through the same Servant. To this is added a prayer for the Church, that it may be gathered into one as the grains were gathered into one loaf of bread.

In the tenth section, prayers of thanksgiving to God are found, to be used after the meal, for His gifts of knowledge and faith and immortality granted

through Christ, and not only for spiritual nourishment but also for bodily food. Then ensues a prayer for the preservation and consummation of the Church, followed by short and simple deprecations. The last leave a vivid impression of impending solemnity: Εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω. Μαρὰν ἀθά. Ἀμήν. And yet only a regulation about Prophets follows.

The next three sections deal with Prophets, true and false; but in the fourteenth section an abrupt return to the Eucharist is made. On Sundays the meeting is to be held for breaking bread and giving thanks. Those who attend are to have confessed their sins so that their offering may be pure, and quarrels must have been settled. Then follows the passage from Malachi, so often quoted in Christian writers of the second and third centuries to display the realisation in the Eucharist of the pure sacrifice which will be offered to God not by the Jews only but throughout the world.

The seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions[1] contains a recension of the Didache, and it is of interest to enumerate the principal developments and divergences which present themselves in the later work. A textual analysis of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth sections of the book of the Constitutions in their relation to the ninth and tenth of the Didache will be found in the last Appendix: the results of the comparison may be summarised as follows.

The two prayers of thanksgiving for the cup and broken bread of the Didache are merged in one long prayer of the Constitutions, introduced by: "Concerning the Eucharist say thus." The prayer contains a thankoffering for salvation vouchsafed in the Incarnation and Passion, and in it is inserted the supplication for the Church from the Didache; in this latter occurs a reference to the bread, which otherwise is not mentioned. The prayer closes with thanksgiving for the precious Body and Blood of JESUS Christ, "of which we consummate these antitypes," proclaiming His Death in obedience to His command. The ensuing regulations which terminate the section are fuller than in the Didache; they are partly connected with the unlawful participation in the Mysteries, by accident or design, of the ἀμύητος, who has not been baptized.

The next section of the Constitutions opens with the words μετὰ δὲ τὴν

[1] "The *Apostolic Constitutions* are the work of the pseudo-Ignatius, and were compiled in Antioch or its neighbourhood in the latter half of the fourth century": Brightman, *Liturgies*, Vol. i. p. xxix.

μετάληψιν changed from the μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι of the Didache. The prayer is richer in thought and expression than its archetype: thanks are offered for the Gifts vouchsafed through JESUS: prayers are renewed for the Church: and at the close the old ejaculations are retained, such as "Maran atha," "Hosanna to the Son of David." The invitation follows in a slightly expanded form: "If any is holy, let him come; if any is not, let him repent and become so." The reader's expectation is aroused and disappointed, as in the Didache: merely a regulation follows, that to Presbyters only is the offering of thanks to be entrusted.

The development arising in the thirtieth section of the Constitutions will be best displayed by a translation:

"On the resurrection-day of the Lord, called the Lord's Day, assemble without fail, giving thanks to God and confessing His beneficence towards us through Christ in delivering us from ignorance, error, and bonds; so that your sacrifice may be blameless and acceptable to God who said of His universal Church: In every place shall be offered to Me incense and a pure sacrifice; for a great King am I, saith the Lord Almighty, and My Name is wonderful among the nations."

The growth seems quite normal; the simplicity of the Didache has become less crude; the motives for thankfulness are more clear; and it is noticeable that the old title of the Breaking of Bread has dropped out.

On the whole, the changes introduced into the Didache are in the directions of richer language and fuller theology, coupled with greater reserve. Epithets are often doubled, and sometimes trebled, in the style of the great Liturgies, for instance, that in the following book of the Constitutions. The Passion, Death, Resurrection and Glorification of the Lord have come to occupy their proper supreme position. Christ is God and Man, the Incarnate Word, the Saviour, whose precious Blood purchased the Church. The infant faith of the Didache has become the adult doctrine of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Sacraments. The ecclesiastical system is fully articulate; the Presbyters celebrate; the sacred Service is withheld from the καταφρονητής, to the exclusion of curious onlookers.

The principle and practice of reserve are so directly inculcated, that the Seventh Book must belong to an earlier epoch or to other circumstances than the Eighth in which a full Liturgy is made public. Moreover it is not the Presbyters who are addressed but laymen, perhaps catechumens. There

appears, then, a perplexing dilemma, unless the forms of §§ 25, 26 are for lay use, to be said privately, like the forms provided in the many modern manuals of instruction or devotion. The faithful is bidden to display his thankfulness "in the matter of the Eucharist," that is to say, for the Gifts vouchsafed him in that Service; and this preliminary act of thankfulness is to be followed by a like act after participation.

It would surely be a violent assumption which could maintain that the very nature and purpose of the Eucharistic Prayers of the Didache was radically changed when they were incorporated into the Apostolic Constitutions. Such a transformation is not made easier to understand when it is remembered that S. Athanasius, the Father of Orthodoxy, recommended the Didache to his catechumens[1]. We venture to urge, therefore, that the Didache does not contain a form of celebration of the Eucharist, but a set of thanksgiving prayers for silent use thereat by the lay members of the Church. The thanksgivings of § 9 are for the cup and bread, in anticipation of their reception; those of § 10 are for the Gifts then already received[2]. The co-existing richness and poverty of the Didache become thus intelligible, especially when the dread of exposing holy things to the desecration of "dogs" is also taken into account. Whether this jealous guardianship of the sacred treasures of the Church, savouring as it does of Jewish exclusiveness, was entirely justifiable or not, need not be considered here; the fact, however, possesses significance[3].

It is natural that the Didache should convey little precise information on the higher aspects of the Eucharist, if the hypothesis of reserve is accepted. The incidental use of *θυσία* three times in § 14 hints at unveiled treasures of knowledge and grace, revered as they were concealed. In conclusion, without entering into further speculation the plain and direct testimony of the Didache may be summarised. The Eucharist was "enshrined" in a social

[1] Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual*: an interesting and encyclopaedical work.

[2] According to the view adopted, *εὐχαριστία* and *εὐχαριστεῖν* will have specific or general meanings in the various places of their occurrence. The final injunction of § 10: *τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν*, is difficult to understand from the point of view adopted; it would seem to imply that the prayers were offered by a president.

[3] There is some resemblance here to the conclusions of Dr Salmon, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1888, p. 616, as regards the exhibition of reserve in the Didache; but up to now we cannot share his belief that "the Eucharist proper is not treated of before the fourteenth chapter."

meal, celebrated on Sundays, after confession, with thanksgiving; the celebrants were officers carefully elected from among a congregation of pure-hearted men; clergy and laity strove everywhere and always to offer a pure sacrifice in the sacred Feast.

THE EUCHARIST IN JUSTIN

The personal importance of Justin has been already urged, and the apologetic aim of his writings renders them especially serviceable because of their expository character. The First Apology and the Dialogue with Trypho contain several passages concerned with the celebration and doctrine of the Eucharist. Written before the close of the first half of the second century, they may be presumed to represent both the Roman and the Asiatic practices and beliefs at the opening of that century, for Justin was familiar with both East and West, and what he describes has nowhere the appearance of innovation. A professedly apologetic work cannot be reformatory or revolutionary; from its very nature it expounds and defends that which is already in settled existence.

The First Apology is addressed to the uninitiated Pagan; the Dialogue appeals to the adherent of the Old Testament, and so has a Judaic colour. The absence of the specific, the presence of the bare elements and principles of Christian ritual and creed, are to be expected; Justin cannot write all he knows and feels; still less can he be supposed to expound the entire conscious consciousness of the Church. The extracts are simple and direct, adapted to readers who on the one hand were ignorant or misinformed about the rudiments of Christianity, or who on the other hand were by birth and education prejudiced in favour of Judaism.

In the Apology, as a reference to the materials will show, two forms of celebration are recounted, the one slightly special as being post-baptismal, but not differing essentially from the second, the normal weekly Eucharist.

In the former, united prayers are offered for the neophyte immediately after his Baptism and introduction to the community. The brethren then salute him and each other with a kiss. A cake of bread and a cup of

wine-and-water are then placed before the president, who praises God through the names of the Son and Holy Spirit, and gives thanks for His gifts. At the close of this long and solemn prayer the congregation responds: Amen. Then deacons distribute the consecrated bread and wine-and-water to those present, who partake of them; to the absent, their portion is conveyed. Only the baptized, who maintain a pure life, receive the Eucharistic food.

In the latter, a general assemblage is formed on Sunday; and the Apostolic or Prophetic scriptures are read "as time allows." The reader is other than the president, who preaches on what has been read. Then all rise to their feet and prayer is offered up like that of the post-baptismal celebration. The solemn prayer at an end, bread is set before the president, and wine-and-water; and the Service then proceeds as already described. The president, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, utters prayers and thanksgivings, and the people answer: Amen. Every one receives a share of the consecrated elements, and partakes reverently; to those not present they are carried by the hands of the deacons. A collection is made, to be lodged with the president, so that he may disburse the fund for the benefit of the sick and needy.

Such is the gist of the double account of celebrations of the Eucharist presented by Justin to the Roman Empire. The Eucharist is identical with the Lord's Supper, for in the context Justin describes the Institution. Its main features are familiar because largely similar to the English Communion Service; there is the reading, the sermon, the general prayer and thanksgiving, the bread, the mixed cup, the consecration, the distribution, the participation; and, at some stage or other, the collection. The orderliness of the Service is apparent, though the president is allowed elasticity. Its corporate character is beautifully realised in graphic touches like: κοινὰς εὐχάς, φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα, ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες. The solemnity of the Service is discerned in the prayer in the threefold Name, and in the assertion of the sacredness of the consecrated bread and wine-and-water. There is a formal invocation of the Divine blessing to make the elements Eucharist.

One or two notes on the language may be added. Probably ὁ προεστώς is used to describe the celebrant for simplicity's sake, though the technical term διάκονοι is retained for those whose office is subordinate. To the pagan

reader, διάκονοι would explain itself sufficiently well, whilst ἐπίσκοπος or πρεσβύτερος would be less intelligible to express that for which προεστώς would suffice. The phrases ὕδωρ καὶ οἶνος and ὕδωρ καὶ κρᾶμα for the contents of the cup have been considered strange; but Justin's purpose is to enforce the fact that the cup was mixed, the contents being water together with ordinary drinking-wine, in contrast with the Mithraic cup of water only which he mentions later. The qualification: ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, witnesses to a certain elasticity of liturgical forms; the Eucharistic Uses have not yet appeared in their full and perfect beauty.

Justin's description of celebrations of the Eucharist recapitulates much that has been seen to exist in earlier days and in various places. The sermon recalls S. Paul at Troas; the thanksgiving is prominent in the Didache; the bread and wine carry the mind back to Corinth. So far as our knowledge goes, there is no essential feature in which this Service differs, except by greater fulness, from those of which there is distinct but fragmentary evidence at Jerusalem, A.D. 30; at Corinth, A.D. 50; at Troas, A.D. 60; in Peraea, A.D. 100; in Bithynia, A.D. 110; and in Phrygia, A.D. 100+. Other passages of Justin will be found to declare that the celebrations are to be conducted by proper persons; and more than once Justin declares that the Eucharist is celebrated universally, over the whole earth.

After the outward form, Justin's testimony to the inward significance of the Eucharist awaits examination. Towards the middle of the second extract will be found words which may be translated:

"We do not receive these things as ordinary bread and ordinary drink, but

as	so
JESUS Christ our Saviour,	the food[1] made Eucharist
being incarnated by word of God,	by prayer of word from Him
took both flesh and blood	is both Flesh and Blood
for our salvation,	of that JESUS who was incarnated."

[1] From which by change blood and flesh of ours are nourished.

Justin is here speaking of two parallel and analogous processes. The first is the unique change by which the Son of God assumed flesh and blood, the agency or mediation being a word of God. The second is the regular change by which the bread and wine (ordinary food which our bodies

digest) become Christ's Flesh and Blood, the agency or mediation being prayer of a word derived from Him.

The passage is not thus understood by Harnack. He explains *κατὰ μεταβολήν* to mean that "the holy food, like all nourishment, is completely transformed into our flesh; but what Justin has in view here is most probably the body of the resurrection[1]." We have rather seen in the words of the *κατὰ μεταβολήν* clause a vigorous assertion of the fact that the bread and wine before consecration are ordinary, natural and physical food. The balance of the analogy instituted by Justin is more complete if this sense of the words is taken; and the interpretation adopted is borne out by strikingly similar statements in Irenaeus, which may be brought forward at once. The economic change induced by consecration is summed up by the later writer thus: *ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία*, and here the epithets *ἀπὸ γῆς* and *κοινός* express precisely the same fact in relation to the bread as the phrase in Justin: *ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν*. Still more exactly is the parallelism in the manner of asserting the merely and truly physical character of the bread before the Invocation seen in the words: secundum nos, occurring in Irenaeus' account of the Institution: eum qui ex creatura est panis; calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos.

Harnack is certainly right when he proceeds to say that Justin regards the economy of the Eucharist as parallel to the economy of the Incarnation. The great truth here begins to be consciously realised and explicitly stated that the sacrament of the Eucharist has its origin, analogue, and efficacy in and through the supreme Sacrament of the Incarnation. The teaching is still more clear in Irenaeus, and it may without exaggeration be called a corner-stone of Catholic Theology.

Sunday is proved by the Apologist to possess a special fitness as the regular day of celebration of the Eucharist. It is the first of days: the day when God produced order out of chaos: the day, moreover, of the Lord's Resurrection. There is great propriety, he urges, in holding the Eucharist on this best of days,—a powerful testimony to Justin's estimate of the place of the Sacrament in the Christian life. In this way Eucharistic

[1] *History of Dogma*, Eng. Trans., Vol. i. p. 211 n. 1.

gladness is associated with the Creation and the Resurrection; and there is suggested that the thought of Christus Consummatus as well as of Christus Patiens is included within the sphere of ideas which the Eucharist should make arise in the mind.

Among the many aspects of the Eucharist, the more solemn, according to a convenient misuse of the word, are perforce withheld from the pagan public; it is to his Jewish readers that Justin can best display the fulness of the truth. In the third extract printed above, from the Dialogue with Trypho, he writes that the meal-offering made by those cleansed from leprosy was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, "which JESUS Christ our Lord prescribed to be made (offered) for a memorial of His Passion on behalf of men cleansed in soul from all evil." The passage is somewhat involved in style, but the sense is unmistakable. The Lord prescribed the consecrated bread, ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, to be offered as a thanksgiving sacrifice to God for cleansing from the leprosy of sin by the Lord's Passion. This sacrificial side of the Eucharist is made by the Apologist the occasion of an appeal to a type of mind saturated with sacrificial conceptions; but it cannot be assumed lightly that the Apologist, in a zeal to be all things to all men, has gone beyond the truth. The sacrificial teaching embodied in Justin's writings and repeated by Irenaeus forms an organic part of the consistent scheme of doctrine to which the Church awakened gradually under the necessity of self-preservation in the presence of the attacks of paganism, the canker of heresy, and the loving effort by all good means to win souls through herself to God.

The two reasons for Eucharistic thankfulness here given to the Jewish world are those already given to the Pagan world; they link themselves to the Creation and the Resurrection. The Lord's Passion and Death are regarded as leading to "the complete overthrow of principalities and powers." Justin then returns to "the sacrifices offered by us," and quotes Malachi's message that God demands and will have a new and pure Sacrifice offered over the whole world[1]. This pure sacrifice is the Eucharist.

The fourth extract, from Justin's colloquy with the typical Jew, follows

[1] Harnack says: "Malachi i 11 demanded a solemn Christian sacrifice," and assigns the influence of this verse a place among four causes of which the sacrificial view was the effect in the second century. See *History of Dogma*, Eng. Trans., i. 209 n. 2. The text, however, is used, here and elsewhere, to indicate God's demand not for a sacrifice, but for its purity.

upon a quotation from Isaiah, applied to the bread which the Lord ordained to be offered (ποιεῖν) for a memorial of His Incarnation, effected for the sake of the souls which should benefit by His Passion; and to the cup which He prescribed to be offered with thanksgiving for a memorial of His Blood.

In the next citation the sacrifices of the Old Testament are contrasted with the Eucharistic sacrifice of the New, to wit, the bread and cup offered by the Christian faithful the world over. Here again the supreme place of the Eucharist in the Christian life is made plain; the ubiquity of its celebration measures its claim upon the love of every Christian community. The nature of the sacrifice is defined more clearly; it consists in prayers and thanksgivings. The sacrifice of the Eucharist is a spiritual sacrifice. Christians received that they should perform only these sacrifices, for a remembrance of their twofold food, wherein the Passion of the Son of God is recalled to the minds of those for whom it was undergone. These prayers and thanksgivings are offered by "every race of men to the Father and Maker of all things through the name of the Crucified JESUS." The sacrifice is no repetition of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross, save in the sense of recalling and commemorating that one unique Event. It is a humbler sacrifice, yet pleasing to God: the sacrifice of hearts uplifted to our Father in the offering of prayer and thanks and praise.

The first passage quoted above is from the Prologue to the First Apology. The Pagan reader is bid observe that Christians have their libations and sacrifices, so that they are far from being "atheists." For all they eat they are wont to praise God "by a word of prayer and thanks"; but as regards their offerings they use them for their own good and the help of the needy instead of destroying them with fire. In fine, for all the blessings of life, both temporal and spiritual, they give solemn thanks to the Giver of all, being so taught by JESUS Christ. The view of sacrifice here exposed would, in modern days, have reference to the giving of alms more than to any other part of the Eucharistic Service.

In conclusion, the question already mooted may be summarily answered. How far is the idea of Sacrifice truly inherent in the Lord's Supper, and how far can it be allowed to be, in Justin at least, a mode of speech, or a weak meeting of Jew and Pagan half-way? Can it be that the Apologist, consciously or unconsciously, produces fragments of Christian faith and practice, which can have a sacrificial look, so that he may engage the affections of

Jewish and Pagan minds, replete with sacrificial instincts? We urge that the widest view is the truest, the view which acknowledges the presence of the Divine image in every man and which leaves the candour of the Martyr-Apologist unimpaired. Sacrificial instincts, universally visible in varying degrees throughout mankind, have surely a measure of eternal truth in them; they find their chastened recapitulation in this Christian Sacrament, instituted with words and amid circumstances calculated to ensure that its sacrificial aspect could not be entirely ignored by those who were familiar with them.

THE EUCHARIST IN IRENAEUS

The position of Irenaeus as the first great theologian of the Church after SS. John and Paul, and his close connexion with the Apostolic age, have been already described. The passages cited above from his work against Heresies, composed about twenty years before the end of the second century, and addressed to the members of the Church universal, may therefore be considered without further delay.

The first passage shows the Lord giving counsel to His Disciples to offer to God firstfruits of His creatures in the shape of the bread and wine which He pronounced to be His Body and Blood. Then and thus was taught the oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, following the Apostolic teaching, continues to offer to God; this is the pure sacrifice of which the prophet Malachi spoke.

In the second extract again the Eucharist is the Church's oblation, reckoned a pure sacrifice with God. As under the Old Covenant, firstfruits of His creation are to be offered to God, but now spontaneously as from freemen, not perfunctorily as from slaves. The conscience sanctifies a sacrifice, and renders it acceptable; and so, since the Church makes her offerings with sincerity of heart, they are pure in His sight.

The great truths underlying the Eucharist are used by Irenaeus to rebut the falsehoods into which some have strayed. How can heretics hold the consecrated bread, over which thanks have been given, to be the Body, and the cup the Blood of the Lord, while they retain their mistaken views about Christ? And how can they imagine the Christian's flesh in-

capable of sharing in eternal life, when they grant that it is nourished by the Lord's Body and Blood? "Let them either change their views or abstain from the offerings aforesaid."

Christians offer to God His own, and so "proclaim the fellowship and union of flesh and spirit." As the earthly bread by the invocation[1] of God is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, so the flesh of the Christian receiving the Eucharist gains "the hope of the resurrection unto eternity." It is God's will that gifts be offered at His altar frequently, without fail; the altar is in heaven, for heavenward are prayers and offerings directed.

The third excerpt is part of an appeal against an heretical view of the Sonship of Christ. If such a view were true, how came our Lord to say that the bread was His Body, and the mixed chalice His Blood?

The fourth is a strenuous vindication of the salvation of the whole man. If the flesh do not share in eternal life, the Lord suffered in vain; the cup of the Eucharist is not the communion of His Blood, nor the broken bread of His Body. Now blood implies "veins and flesh and the rest of human substance," which the Word of God assumed. God of His bounty vouchsafes His creation to maintain the life of His children, and provides both for flesh and spirit. The cup, which is of His creation, He makes to be His Blood, by which our blood is nourished; the bread, which is of His creation, He makes to be His Body, by which our bodies are nourished. When, therefore, the mixed cup and the made bread receive the word of God, and the Eucharist becomes Body of Christ, from these "the hypostasis[2] of our flesh" is built up and augmented. The gift of God cannot be denied to a body thus nourished in its essence by eternal Food, and made a very member of the eternal Body of Christ. The words of S. Paul, that we are members of His Body, relate not to the spirit only, but to the entire economy of man,—to flesh, to muscle, to bone as well as to spirit. Just as the natural bread and wine receive the word of God and become

[1] Reading ἐπίκλησιν for ἔκκλησιν, with Dr Swete, "Eucharistic Belief in the Second and Third Centuries," *Journal of Theological Studies*, iii. 170 n. 4.

[2] Ὑπόστασις is etymologically equivalent to *substance*, but better translated by *essence*. It seems to indicate the underlying entity which gives to the body its existence as a mechanism capable of displaying itself dynamically, chemically, electrically, and in a word physically, in a world of such like things.

supernatural Eucharist, so the Christian's body nourished by the sacramental Food is consummated to eternal life.

As a whole, the passages selected combine the passionate faith and fervid devotion of an Ignatius with the calm and deliberative genius of a Justin; and they are the work of a theologian. But it is no play of the speculative faculties in which Irenaeus indulges; he does not write for the pleasure of writing, nor even for the elaboration of a doctrinal code; he writes with a distinct purpose clearly before him, to refute the heresies which threaten the Truth guarded by the Church. Yet, again, to effect his purpose he is naturally compelled to marshal the facts of the Gospel in a consistent array which shall constitute the centre of his defence of Catholic Christianity and of his attack upon heresy.

Between the teachings of Justin and of Irenaeus on the Eucharist there are resemblances, in some ways both obvious and close. To the minds of both Fathers the elements are not after consecration any longer *κοινὸς ἄρτος* and *κοινὸν πόμα*, but *Εὐχαριστία*, the Body and Blood of Christ. Both assign the same effective cause to the change that is wrought; it is brought about by a prayer of Divine ordinance, prayer of word from Him; and the change is by addition, without any subtraction. In the eyes of both the Eucharist is a sacrifice, the pure offering made to God by His people who form the Church. Both, again, trace back the Sacrament to the Son of God, and hold like views about the Last Supper.

Furthermore, we cannot detect any trace of opposition between the teaching of Justin on the Eucharist and the teaching of Irenaeus; their divergences are variations of emphasis. In Justin's writings it may be that comparatively the memorial aspect of the Eucharist is prominent: the Passion and Death of the Lord are brought to remembrance, and the Resurrection is no less inwardly recalled and outwardly proclaimed. Did Irenaeus ignore or neglect this aspect, because it did not serve his purpose to employ it as an argument in his vindication of the Theology of the Incarnation? The one writer strives against the half-truths of foes within his own household; the other seeks to remove the hostility and contempt of those without. It is very far from surprising, surely, that Irenaeus should lay stress on features of the Eucharist which were not equally, if at all, serviceable for Justin's purpose.

That Irenaeus should appeal to the Eucharist so often and confidently for

confirmation of the views he advocates and destruction of the views he condemns, is testimony that the Sacrament was the very heart of Christian corporate life in the second century, as it has been seen to be in the first. What Irenaeus considers is not so much the delineation of the Eucharist,—rather, he can take for granted what Justin has to describe and explain,—he introduces only those features which can be brought to bear upon the doctrinal questions, of the Person of Christ, of the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the like, with which he is grappling. And so the relatively low place which the memorial aspect of the Eucharist finds in the passages cited from Irenaeus, the little prominence of the commemoration in the Eucharist of the Passion, Death and Resurrection of the Lord, do not afford a satisfactory basis for an argument from silence that Irenaeus did not hold such a view, or esteemed it not highly.

It was to be expected, also, that Irenaeus' Eucharistic testimony should overlap Justin's in many respects. For instance, in point of fact, Justin mentions thanksgiving for the blessings of this life as though it were a feature of every meal,—at least, his language would be patient of such an interpretation; Irenaeus, however, reminds his readers that this thankfulness is summed up, concentrated and sanctified, in the oblation of the bread and wine before the invocation of the Divine working. The unfailing thankfulness of Justin and the thanksgiving oblation of Irenaeus together represent, it may be, the whole habit of the Church.

Again, the term "New Covenant" does not seem to be applied by Justin with direct reference to the Eucharistic Gifts, whereas Irenaeus has it frequently. The point possesses little significance, for in the Dialogue with Trypho, Christians are declared to have their sacrifices as well as the Jews; and if the latter were under the Old Covenant, the former must have their place through a New Covenant.

The passages of Irenaeus convey information of the Catholic conception of the Eucharist in three or four several directions.

First, the Eucharist is celebrated throughout the world with frequency by Divine command. The central part of the service is the Epiklesis, which is preceded by thankoffering for God's natural gifts apparent in the bread and wine, and succeeded by thanksgiving for God's spiritual Gifts conveyed in the Body and Blood. The bread is broken, and the cup is of mingled wine.

Secondly, the economy of the Eucharist is very clearly stated by Irenaeus. Evidently the natural elements are universally acknowledged to be after consecration the Body and Blood of Christ. They then consist of two things: an earthly, the bread and wine: a heavenly, the Body and Blood of the Lord. This twofoldness of aspect and efficacy is not yet expressed by a single technical word applicable to sacramental transactions in general. The time was nearly ripe, and within a score of years Tertullian had applied the Latin *sacramentum* to express the mode of double efficacy of which an example within the sphere of contemplation of every mind is human life itself[1]. Thus the sacramental view of life was familiar to Irenaeus if the vocabulary at his disposal was incomplete; and his applications of the recognised and accepted doctrine of the Eucharist to the demonstration of the Resurrection of the Flesh, harsh and even repellent as some may esteem them, are doubtless the struggling into expression of the conviction that Christian truth and grace eternally concern the whole human economy. There is no "transubstantiation" in Irenaeus' theology: the bread and wine are after consecration more than they were before, but in no respect are they less: beside being bread and wine, they are now the Body and Blood of the Lord: their new nature is analogous to the relation of body and spirit in man, who though one is twofold.

Thirdly, the Eucharist is a sacrifice: the pure sacrifice prophesied in the Old Testament, and fulfilled in the New Testament: the offering to God of His gifts, both natural and spiritual. The sacrifice is relative and not absolute, human and not Divine: for it is acceptable only if it come from a clean heart. The altar of the sacrifice is a spiritual heavenly altar: for it is to Heaven that "our prayers and our offerings are directed."

The Eucharist, lastly, is the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, whereby the faithful recipient becomes a member of Christ: he is in Christ as Christ is in him.

[1] 'Then me, his hand firm clasped in mine, he brought,
With joyful face that gave me comfort great':

so Dean Plumptre translated Dante, *Hell*, Canto iii, lines 19, 20, commenting: 'The "clasped hand" tells of an experience which had felt the power of that sacrament of human help.'

PART III

SYNTHESIS OF EVIDENCE

ASPECTS OF THE EARLY EUCHARIST

THE preceding analysis of the *loci classici* in the canonical and standard Church literature of the greater part of the first two centuries will have shown, it is hoped, the mode and significance of the Institution of the Eucharist, and its inevitable development whilst continuing faithful to its Divine origin. In the tree planted by the Sower there ensued a legitimate growth; pruning there certainly was, but of grafting no evidence has been found. In prosecuting this study the pertinent passages from canonical and other writings have been examined successively and analysed in their various bearings. It remains now to gather up into heads the evidence thus collected, and to combine it to illustrate the several aspects of the Eucharist which will be examined apart in the sections following. These sections will attempt to trace the development in various directions of Church practice and Church doctrine in relation to the Eucharist; both in the relative sense, looking towards man: and in the absolute sense, looking towards God.

The precise weight attached to any cited authority may be estimated differently by different minds; but this uncertainty will be avoided as far as possible by presenting facts in various combinations without so far essaying interpretation as to allow of any considerable intrusion of personal bias and individual judgment. It is the synthesis of what has been analysed, an almost mechanical process, with which we now concern ourselves, more with the aim of economising the reader's time than of impressing him with particular deductions and conclusions.

The aim of the following synthesis is therefore to combine the historical facts already enumerated in trains converging upon the main features of the primitive Eucharist. The circumstances of its celebration, its associated discipline, its efficacy for spiritual growth, its security of outward unification and its power of inward communion, its eucharistic and memorial and sacrificial aspects, its mysterious economy in relation to the physical and spiritual, the human and the Divine,—these are the heads on which the teaching of the Evangelists and S. Paul, the Apostolic Fathers and Writers, and Justin and Irenaeus, will be combined.

The principle of development, a fundamental necessity of thought, with a realm of application as wide as that of human comprehension, a principle as old as the beginnings of science and philosophy and preeminently an ancient possession of Christian thought[1], will control the efforts now to be made. As the earlier develops into the later, the later displays the innate tendency and vital significance of the earlier. It is this principle of continuity, further, which enables us to draw through isolated points of evidence the continuous curve of history, and to infer from isolated facts the continuous sequence of events. This broad determination of the course of history is rescued from the realm of the purely subjective and merely hypothetical by the postulate of a didactic purpose in the survival of fragmentary evidence.

I

THE CELEBRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

What was the custom at Troas on the occasion of S. Paul's visit in the course of his third missionary journey may safely be assumed to indicate the usage of the mass of the Pauline Churches; and between these and the Churches of other founding there is no substantial reason for drawing any sharp line of distinction. At Troas the community assembled to break bread

[1] The principle was taught by Christ Himself: Mc 4^{26-32}; and the graphic case of plant growth which He selected is present to the minds of Clement of Rome, c. 23, and Irenaeus, l. iv. c. 18. (Cf. also Harvey, Frag. 29.)

on the first day of the week, the day now associated, by a survival of paganism, with the sun. This day, of which the Christian title used by S. John is "the Lord's Day," was fitly associated with the Lord's Supper not only in Asia (and very probably Greece), but also in very early times in Peraea, or whatever range is assigned to the Didache. In Bithynia the Letter of Pliny speaks of a fixed day of assemblage, and of the seven days of the week these remote offshoots of S. Paul's missionary labours would doubtless select Sunday, for which Justin could plead that it was the first day of the week, the day when the universe leaped into order out of chaos at the mandate of God, and the day when the Saviour arose from the tomb. Such a day, a perpetually recurring feast of triumphant gladness, was appropriate indeed to the gladness of the renewal of outward fellowship and inward communion in the joyful assemblage of brethren for the thankful praise of God.

The selection of Sundays for regular celebrations of the Eucharist would lead to intervals, never greater than weekly, between successive Services. Avircius in his Phrygian home, and in his travels to West and East, found himself continually provided with the heavenly Food; and Ignatius, fresh from the conduct of the Antiochene Church, exhorted the Church at Ephesus to make a point of assembling more frequently for Eucharist.

On such a comparatively minute matter of detail as the hour of celebration there is little evidence. It is not clear that at the close of the first century either the evening or the morning had been generally selected. The interaction of communities combined with the inertia of habit would reduce the Catholic Church ultimately to one universal rule, where perturbing influences were absent; but in primitive times the external aids of fixed custom or prescribed discipline were less necessary and numerous than in later days of slackness and distraction. At Troas not a generation after the Resurrection the Breaking of Bread was held in the evening, and the Eucharist involved in a common supper; in Bithynia, at the end of the first century, and so a generation later still, the celebration was almost indisputably before dawn, and not a meal in the ordinary sense.

Nor again is it possible to gain any exact conception of the places of meeting for the Eucharist. At Jerusalem after Pentecost bread was broken at home, and in private, as contrasted with the public prayers in the Temple. The home of a S. John or a S. Mark may have been the scene of these solemn but glad assemblages. Held in the synagogue the Service could not be.

An upper room served the purpose at Troas, and so might recall the upper room of the Institution. Ignatius' letters and the Didache might point to a place set apart for Eucharistic worship, but the inference would be far from certain; and Justin's *ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσίν* does not convey any definite information.

In approaching the investigation of the order of Service in its chronological development it is well to dismiss expectations of arriving thus at a final settlement of those ancillary points of ritual which continue to disturb the devotion of Churchmen. In the century succeeding the martyrdoms of SS. Peter and Paul there is little testimony pertinent for such a purpose; the minds of writers were occupied with far more fundamental principles of Christian doctrine, Christian worship and Christian conduct. To take one example, and no more, it was necessary at a Service held in the late evening or even in the early morning to make use of lights; further, as perhaps at Troas, the number of lights might exceed the limits of a strict necessity, for the Service was the occasion of great thanksgiving. To a modern mind such a practice would seem sufficiently appropriate, but to Christians converted from Judaism or Paganism it would appeal with a special force; the Jews might be familiar with the majestic illuminations of the festal services in the Temple; the Pagans, on the other hand, with the impressive brilliance of the solemn rites of the Mysteries. Light and joy have ever gone together; and the use of the word "Light" in Johannine theology, and the application of the term "Enlightened" to baptized Christians, witness to the intensity of the appeal which the symbolism of light made to the hearts of worshippers in the earliest days[1].

The faculties of speech and song were much exercised in the celebrations of the Eucharist. The Archetype had its prayers of appeal, and its praises of thankfulness, and its homily of instruction[2], and its final hymn. Of these four leading features, of prayer, of praise, of instruction and of song, the first three are stamped with the seal of universality in the pages of Justin's Apology, a little more than a century later. Only glimpses of the growth between the seed and the budding flower can be caught.

[1] The reader will recall the beautiful Hymn of the Greek Church, translated by Keble, and beginning: "Hail, gladdening Light."

[2] The final discourses of the Gospel according to S. John being referred mainly to the Last Supper.

In considering this intervening period of a century from the Institution caution is necessary, and the conjectural nature of the deductions made from the sporadic evidence must be kept in mind. If it is not an erroneous postulate that the Eucharist was the only purely religious service[1] for which Christians regularly assembled in this period, information respecting corporate acts and words of worship may rightly be referred to it. To argue from silence, to enunciate any negative propositions, is more hazardous than to assume that what is not universally recorded was universally existent in fact. The incorporation into a mosaic of every fragment of witness, having regard as far as possible to chronological sequence, is indeed a method leading to occasional error; but it will lead to fewer mistakes than a quasi-sceptical attitude which voices a denial instead of maintaining silence. Somewhere between these inclusive and exclusive procedures lies the golden mean, and nearer to the former than to the latter.

The order of celebration of the Eucharist arose at the very first from the order of Institution; but the more the Gospel narratives are searched for information outside essentials, the more perceptible does our lack of such knowledge become. In this connexion, the Synoptists declare simply and shortly what no Christian could afford not to know; S. John narrates the complementary discourses which no other than he was better able to appreciate, recall, and place on record. Comparison of these two sources of acts and words makes it evident that the Last Supper was more than a momentary procedure, and that there was much more in it than the supreme action of the breaking of the bread, which has been chosen by sacred Art to sum up the events of the Institution. The bread and the cup were the centre of a sequence of prayer, praise, thanksgiving, instruction and song. And in the introductory acts and words, as recorded in each Gospel, there may be discerned that which could have the effect of a penitential discipline of preparation.

The adoption of the Lord's acts in the Last Supper itself, especially the breaking of the bread, would seem to have been universal. At Jerusalem, at Corinth and at Troas in the Apostolic Age the bread was broken. The Didache testifies to the fraction in the place and at the epoch of its composition. Ignatius speaks of it in his letters to the Asiatic Churches as though it

[1] The aim of the Eucharist was primarily religious, and of the Agape primarily social; the question of combinations of the two does not affect the argument.

were a feature of the Eucharist in every Church. Justin and Irenaeus refer to it in such terms that one cannot resist the conclusion that this ritual was as universal as the oecumenical Church.

Of set forms of prayer and praise used in the Eucharist there are not a few indications in nearly all the writings which have been cited. The regular use of the sacred words of Institution, if only in their briefest essence: THIS IS MY BODY, THIS IS MY BLOOD, might be inferred from their central significance in the rite, from their record in the first three Gospels, and from their supreme importance in the eyes of S. Paul, Justin and Irenaeus. The command: DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME, would fittingly be repeated, or recalled, on the occasions of its fulfilment.

As regards the supplications and thanksgivings in which these Divine gems were set, it will appear that, though liberty was granted and taken for the spontaneous expression of individual devotion, general comprehensive forms giving voice to the identical needs and joint aspirations of the Society are of early occurrence and of increasing completeness and prevalence. With the realisation of necessary diversity of function in the Christian Body, and the recognition of the priestly office, there must have arisen an expectation on the side of the congregation and an obligation on the side of the priest, who was representative of the congregation, that the utterances of the one should be not the outcome of his own personal inclinations but the expression of the corporate attitude towards God of the many. So would arise Uses in various communities, each expressing in the best conceivable way what it was desired to have expressed. Mutual communication between the several Churches, which prescriptions of hospitality show to have been far from small, would then beget a continual tendency towards the assimilation of these various Uses, and their codification in a few standard Liturgies.

In the Church at Corinth, itself a morbid specimen of a community in which liberty had become license, there was much freedom in the offering of the prayers and praises at the Lord's Supper. Each brother might assume the office of president, while the rest became laymen relatively to him. The president expressed himself at times with a lack of self-control which led him into unintelligible rhapsodies; those present signified their assent at the close, sometimes without clear comprehension of what they approved. This lax condition of affairs called forth the emphatic disapproval of the

Apostolic founder: but he contented himself with insisting upon the practice of self-control.

Apostles were not tied to forms which later generations delighted to extract from their writings. Something of this perfect freedom was extended to the transitory and intermediary office of "prophet," a minister allowed by the Didache to dispense with set forms of prayer. As late as Justin's day and presumably at Rome, the very focus of an orderliness verging in later days upon formalism, it is implied to all seeming that the presbyters possessed and exercised the faculty of spontaneous utterance, with or without a framework of settled forms, in their presentation before God of the prayers and praises of their flocks.

By the side of this elasticity, inevitable and wholesome in the first ages of the Church's life, reprehensible and detrimental in later days, there is a slowly increasing attainment of fixity of form in Eucharistic worship, as the fittest words and phrases and paragraphs survived and the less apt disappeared. The use of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" marks the first stage in the crystallisation of Christian sentiment and aspiration. If S. Paul is encouraging the adoption in private of such modes of expressing Christian feeling, it follows that these methods would be all the more approved in joint worship at the Eucharist. The hymn incorporated in S. Paul's first extant letter to Timothy may have been often used at the Lord's Supper:

Ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,
ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

Despite the fact that Justin does not speak explicitly of liturgical forms to the pagan world, the Epistle of Clement, of a generation earlier, and by contrast an esoteric writing, contains, as has been seen, phrases and passages of which the compactness and polish could well be accounted for as the result of repetition in the Eucharistic Services of the Church at Rome. Such a passage as that quoted above:

"Yea, and let us ourselves, then, being gathered together in concord with intentness of heart, cry unto Him as from one mouth earnestly that we may be made partakers of His great and glorious promises,"

bears the stamp of liturgical use: if not employed at Rome it could hardly fail to find acceptance at Corinth. From the fifty-ninth to the sixty-first chapters extends a long prayer excellently adapted for a general prayer of supplication and thanksgiving in the Eucharistic Service. It is difficult to suppose that the last of these chapters does not record (not a possible, but) a regular prayer for "rulers and governors upon the earth." It runs[1]:

"Thou, Lord and Master, hast given them the power of sovereignty through Thine excellent and unspeakable might, that we knowing the glory and honour which Thou hast given them may submit ourselves unto them, in nothing resisting Thy will. Grant unto them, therefore, O Lord, health, peace, concord, stability, that they may administer the government which Thou hast given them without failure. For Thou, O heavenly Master, King of the ages, givest to the sons of men glory and honour and power over all things that are upon the earth. Do Thou, Lord, direct their counsel according to that which is good and well-pleasing in Thy sight, that, administering in peace and gentleness with godliness the power which Thou hast given them, they may obtain Thy favour. O Thou, who alone art able to do these things and things far more exceeding good than these for us, we praise Thee through the High-priest and Guardian of our souls, JESUS Christ, through whom be the glory and the majesty unto Thee both now and for all generations and for ever and ever. Amen."

The final doxology has a perfection which suggests regular employment: "The grace of our Lord JESUS Christ be with you and with all men in all places who have been called by God and through Him: through whom to Him be glory, honour, might and majesty, an everlasting throne, from the ages past and for ever and ever. Amen."

With these signs of the prevalence of liturgical forms at Rome are to be coordinated tokens of their occurrence in Asia and Bithynia in the first half of the second century. In the Letter of the Church of Smyrna on the Martyrdom of Polycarp are treasured up the last words of their aged Bishop. The form and substance of the words forcibly recall the Eucharist, especially in the sublime doxology with which the Martyr ceased to speak:

"For this cause, yea and for all things, I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, through the eternal and heavenly High-priest, JESUS Christ,

[1] We gratefully acknowledge here our continual indebtedness to the translations in Lightfoot and Harmer's edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

Thy beloved Son, through whom to Thee with Him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now and ever and for the ages to come. Amen."

And again the antiphonal rendering of a "hymn" by the Bithynian Churches at their early Services points to their adherence to fixed, and, it may be, metrical, forms of praise as well as to a prescribed formula (sacramentum) of self-devotion.

The Didache furnishes direct proof of the use of definite liturgical forms in many Judaic communities of Christians. If the two thanksgivings for the cup and the bread are granted to be intended for private devotion[1], there will be granted more elaborate forms of longer usage, followed in the main by the ἐπίσκοποι and superseded only temporarily at the desire of the itinerant προφήτης. The long prayer after the Meal affords the same *a fortiori* argument. The most solemn forms of prayer appear to be withheld from publicity, and to have grown in secret, until reticence was no longer necessary and the great Liturgies of the fourth century were in circulation.

From the comparatively detailed description of the Eucharistic celebrations given by Justin a fixity of procedure is established, corresponding to which some fixity of language must have been observed. The introduction of the definite article,—"the" prayers, "the" thanksgivings,—suggests the sinking of the personal; and in the corporate offering of prayer, which "all together" sent up, resides the desirability of the use, however slight, of language which has received the stamp of general approval, and is not too distracting in its novelty. The mention of hymns and praises (πομπαί) indicates settled forms of diction.

The reading of Holy Scripture constituted a regular feature of Eucharistic worship from the Apostolic age. The letters of S. Paul were read publicly, and the occasion of the lection can hardly have been other than the regular and solemn assemblage with which the Eucharist is associated. In Justin's day the Old Testament was read as well as the New: "the memoirs of the Apostles or writings of the Prophets are read as far as time admits."

Intimately connected with this reading of Scripture is the sermon or set discourse, which also derives from Pauline practice. S. Paul's mode

[1] There are many difficulties in the way of accepting this view; yet, on the whole, it seems to us the least unsatisfactory.

of speech at Troas, before and after the actual Breaking, is described by two significantly different words, denoting set discourse and informal conversation[1] respectively; the former points to something not greatly different from the modern "sermon." No further special allusion to this appears until Justin's day: he depicts the president basing a formal discourse upon the reading of Scripture which has immediately preceded.

In the consecration of the elements, the bread was broken, the wine mixed, but of the actual words used, except at the Last Supper, no record has been made. A repetition of the procedure of that First Eucharist was aimed at, we may conclude; the recital of the Lord's own words and the repetition of His acts were doubtless never wanting. In Justin, the consecration is by prayer of word from the Lord; in Irenaeus, the Holy Spirit is invoked.

By Justin's day it was customary for the deacons to distribute what the presiding presbyter had consecrated; and, further, to convey to the absent brethren the sacred food, a kind of "reservation" sufficiently innocuous, and not liable to abuse except through motives very diverse from the consideration displayed in this practice. Both bread and wine were distributed and consumed, not only in the second century but in the Pauline churches of the first century: of any withholding of either at any time or in any place within our limits we know nothing.

The usage of the kiss, symbolic of the love which bound together the brotherhood of Christians, is repeatedly enjoined by SS. Paul and Peter; and Justin refers to it in his account of Baptism succeeded by the Eucharist. It would seem to have been a regular feature of the latter Service, and to have preceded the consecration of the elements.

The collection of alms, in the Corinthian and Galatian Churches of Apostolic days not an accompaniment of the Lord's Supper, is fairly clearly associated with the Eucharist in Justin, though the writer may be passing from his account of the Service to a general statement of the obligations willingly incurred by the more wealthy members of the Community. There is no evidence of the giving of alms during the celebration; but at Corinth, food was brought to the Supper, and the open table corresponded in effect to the modern collection of alms for the poor.

These deductions from the information gathered about early celebrations

[1] Διαλέγεσθαι and ὁμιλεῖν.

of the Eucharist are offered to the reader as suggestions which, however he may traverse or supplement them, will serve as a first rough approximation to the truth, truth which is so precious because it belongs to the early days of unfaded enthusiasm and zeal, of primitive purity and simplicity.

II

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE EUCHARIST

The task of sketching the disciplinary regulations which were employed from the first to guard the Eucharist from internal abuse and external violation is commensurate with that of tracing the rise and growth of the organic life of the Church. In a sense the Church had the Eucharist for focus; the whole of Church life radiated from it and was reflected upon it. The other chief Sacrament initiated the career of the Christian, and so had an unique but isolated place in his spiritual course. Baptism was and is the introduction to the Eucharist, which is the ever-flowing fountain from which the spiritual life, begun at Baptism, is replenished and augmented[1]. It must suffice to indicate this intimate connexion between the discipline of the Eucharist and the organisation of the Church, and consider only the fontal passages in their bearing upon this second aspect.

The rigour of Eucharistic discipline from Apostolic days is a striking and indisputable fact, for its severity is clearly displayed in contemporary writings. S. Paul, the protagonist of the inclusiveness of Christ's Church, addresses to the lax Corinthian community rebukes of uncompromising sternness. He bids them take extreme measures, cast out from themselves, exclude from all further intercourse and so debar from the Lord's Supper, the so-called Brother who is impure or avaricious or idolatrous or slanderous, or given to drunkenness or embezzlement. Those who preserve themselves unspotted from such worldly taints are to do more: they must avoid the appearance of evil: for instance, they must beware of social festivities infected with the taint of paganism. There might be no conscious intention of evincing

[1] "Touching Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, we may with consent of the whole Christian world conclude they are necessary, the one to initiate or begin, the other to consummate or make perfect our life in Christ." Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* Bk v. § 67 ad fin.

respect for the "gods" (devils, S. Paul says they are) presiding over the tables from which they ate, perhaps at the invitation of old friends still pagan; and there might even ensue no spiritual detriment to the individual Brother so doing: but "all things are not expedient," and with Apostolic authority S. Paul forbids such practices by pointing out their inconsistency with participation in the Eucharist.

Still further those who attend the Lord's Supper are not free therein from the perils with which the heedless and unwary Brother is beset. There is the danger of unworthy reception of the Divine Gifts, of eating and drinking in the Eucharist without due discernment of the Body and Blood of Christ. This danger is aggravated by the provision of a common table at the Supper. If the Apostle's warning to his Church did not arrive in time, the shocking spectacle may have been displayed in God's sight of men flushed with wine partaking of the holy Food with no fitting discernment of the solemnity of the act they then dared to perform. Whether or not the disorderliness of the Corinthian Church had proceeded to such an extreme, S. Paul depicted a scene which in default of discipline was ever to be feared. He does not absolutely direct the severance of the Common Meal from the Lord's Supper: apparently the two may remain interpenetrating or consecutive; but the satisfaction of the body is to be made truly and really secondary to the nourishment of the spirit. If any one is hungry, he is directed to stay his appetite first at home. The conclusion of the whole matter is the same as the keynote of the Epistle: "Let everything be done in seemliness and orderliness," a command neither superfluous nor commonplace in face of the consequences to which its neglect was leading, and which the Apostle states with unflinching frankness.

The same note of anxiety for the fatal fruits of false freedom, from which the Corinthians had not yet freed themselves, sounds in the Clementine Epistle half-a-century later. The Letter recommends earnestly the more orderly conduct of Church ministrations, in due time, in proper place, by authorised hands. The ministry of the Old Testament typifies that of the New. High-priests, Priests, Levites had their prescribed duties, and have them still; the layman is bound by lay ordinances. This orderliness is especially insisted upon by Clement in the case of the Eucharist. The thanksgiving should be made by each "in his own order," in seemly manner, without transgression of the prescribed rule of ministration. The disciplinary

recommendations of the Roman Church must have been applied first to herself before she could thus gently and firmly reprove the failings of her sister Church.

Clement from the West connects so the observance of due order and the recognition of proper function with the keeping of a good conscience, and this thought is repeated a few years afterwards by Ignatius in the East. To the Church at Tralles he declares that any one transacting in the affairs of the Church anything apart from the Bishop and Presbytery and Deacons is not pure in his conscience. He reminds the Smyrnaeans that an Eucharist, to be valid, must be under the direct or deputed supervision of the Bishop, apart from whom, besides, is no lawful Common Meal (agape) or Baptism. At Antioch, Smyrna and in the Churches of Western Asia generally there was therefore a system of Eucharistic discipline in vital connexion with the threefold order of the Ministry within the Church, although its nature is not detailed more precisely in the earnest and eager farewells of the great Bishop. To suppose that he is here seen making one last agonised effort to advance a new system of ecclesiastical polity, in which seemed to him to reside the only safety of Christianity, is surely the most perverse of paradoxes: not diplomatic machination but loving devotion is the note of the Epistles. And how could he expect in these hurried notes, composed on the way to martyrdom, to impose upon apostolic Churches, rich in the freshness of Johannine and Pauline tradition, fortified by the presence of a Polycarp, a novel organisation and a new discipline? But more than all argument the very spirit of the Letters forbids such an arbitrary supposition. Lastly, it is clear that at Ephesus the Eucharist had its exclusive side: none but professed Churchmen partook of the bread; and at Smyrna again heresy had given rise to schism, and absentees from the Service failed to share the corporate life of the community because they did not perceive or acknowledge the fulness of the truth in Christ.

Pliny's mention of the oath or vow, by which the Christians of Bithynia were wont to bind themselves, is evidence of Eucharistic discipline; and that his two informants were deaconesses is indication of much organisation in the Churches of those remote parts. Certain misdeeds incompatible with a share in the corporate worship of the Eucharist are specified by Pliny: as theft, adultery, embezzlement.

Since Baptism was always the seal of admission into the Christian Com-

munion, it is far from surprising to encounter in the Didache the disciplinary rule: "Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist except those who have been baptised into the Lord's Name." Careless participation is precluded by the ordinance of confession of sins before attendance. Disputes and quarrels must be settled before any one present himself at the Eucharist. The Lord's Gospel is to be the rule of the Churchman's whole life.

The necessity of Baptism is laid down with equal emphasis by Justin Martyr. He displays plainly to his Pagan readers the exclusive aspect of Eucharistic worship: "it is not lawful for any one to partake except for him who believes our teaching to be true; and who has been washed with the washing for remission of sins and unto regeneration; and who lives as Christ ordained." Faith, sealed in Baptism, preserved in purity, every Communicant must have, or he is debarred from the sacred Feast. "God does not accept sacrifices from any one," he reminds the Jew Trypho, "but only through His Priests." So, to the Pagan, familiar with the sharing of food with his gods, Justin describes the outward discipline which protects the sacred Meal of the One God; and to the Jew, more fully enlightened in sacrifices offered to the God of Christians, he shows the regulation which safeguards the Eucharist from within. Thus in meeting the needs of both classes of non-Christian strivers after truth, the Apologist is led to declare the essence of the discipline of the Eucharist both for those who administer and for those who receive.

Of Eucharistic Discipline in Irenaeus' day there is little need to speak, seeing that Church Order was then permanently established in its main Catholic outlines as we now enjoy it.

III

THE EUCHARIST AS A SPIRITUAL MEAL

The poetical language of Avircius expounds a truth the most assured and indisputable in the whole range of the significance and purpose of the Eucharist:

"On all sides Faith set before me food, ΙΧΘΥΣ from a fountain,...which she bestowed upon her friends to eat continually, with precious wine, giving mingled wine with bread."

The truth was unfolded by Christ, as His Disciples were able to bear it, in those discourses recorded by S. John wherein the Lord before the close of the Galilean Ministry already promised the most precious gift of His own Flesh and Blood for the nourishment of souls. The third chapter of the Gospel reveals the new birth at Baptism: the sixth chapter foreshows the sustenance of the new life in Communion. The maintenance of spiritual life is to be parallel to the maintenance of physical life; and the new food is the very Flesh and very Blood of the Lord. It is the antitype of the manna in the wilderness.

This truth also underlies the references to the Eucharist in the Acts and in the Corinthian Epistle so often quoted; and though the critical consideration of these passages tends to show that the Eucharists of Apostolic times were occasions of physical refreshment as well as of spiritual nourishment, the supreme preeminence of the latter is assured. S. Paul draws out at length the analogy between the spiritual Israel of the Old and New Testaments. The sojourn of the Israelites in the desert foreshadowed the passage of the Christian Church through this world. Their common spiritual food and drink typified the Lord's Supper.

S. Ignatius and his readers are so familiar with the fact of the sustenance of spiritual life by the Eucharistic Food, that he can allow it to shape his metaphors. The plain and direct statement found in his letter to the Church at the place of his martyrdom will be remembered: "I do not long for corruptible food nor for the pleasures of this life; I desire God's bread which is Flesh of Christ, who is of David's seed, and I desire for drink His Blood which is incorruptible love."

The prayer after participation in the Didache contains thanksgivings for the bodily food and drink by which man is refreshed and recruited, and more yet for the spiritual food and drink, granted not immediately like the fruits of the earth, but through the mediation of JESUS Christ. The spiritual food and drink are clearly the supernatural concomitants of the bread and cup, the Body and Blood of the Lord; and the prayers of the ninth section corroborate this in a metaphorical way.

The very choice of eating and drinking as the mode of reception of Eucharistic grace illuminates the truth that the spirit is simultaneously nourished, and the narratives of the Vital Discourse and of the Last Supper so plainly and freely declare it, that it seems unnecessary to draw out at

any great length the consequent teaching of Justin and Irenaeus on this primary aspect of the Holy Eucharist. The former calls the consecrated bread and wine "food," and not ordinary food: the latter describes it as twofold, earthly and heavenly, in its nature, possessing a double efficacy to nourish the spirit as well as the body. Irenaeus is also concerned to uphold the doctrine that by the Eucharistic elements not only the spirit but also the hypostasis of the body is nourished to immortality; he assumes as axiomatic that the Eucharist is spiritual food, and his arguments are applied to extend this universally accepted view to the bestowal of perpetuity upon the substantial reality underneath and within bodily existence as apart from the spirit which employs the physical mechanism. At all events it is undisputed and indisputable that the spirit receives immortal life through the heavenly Food of the Eucharist.

IV

THE EUCHARIST AS A COMMUNION

Fellowship with the Church and Communion with Christ are complementary aspects of the Eucharist noticed in the writings before us from the teaching of SS. John and Paul onwards. Both are realised in the one Food from the one Table bestowed by the one Lord.

The note of fellowship is heard throughout the New Testament, and nowhere more strongly than where there is reference to the Breaking of Bread in the Lord's Supper. After the Ascension the faithful continued steadfastly in the fellowship associated with the breaking of the one bread; and the same chord is struck in the one accord with which the celebrations of the Eucharist were conducted "at home."

The altruistic instruction of S. Paul in the central portion of his first Epistle to the Corinthian Church is summed up and clinched in an appeal to the significance of the Lord's Supper: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not fellowship of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not fellowship of the Body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we the many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread."

The fellowship of the Eucharist arises from the Communion in Christ; it is the outward aspect of the inward union in Christ,—as the one bread and the

one Body are partaken, so fellowship with each other and Communion with Christ are secured[1]. Participation in the Body of Christ, best expressed by the idea of eating, renews Baptismal incorporation into that eternal and indivisible Body, producing spiritual fellowship of the communicants with each other; and this higher Communion has its outward seal and corroboration in the sharing of one bread and the drinking from one cup, than which exists no more forcible expression of fellowship between man and man[2]. This Communion with Christ is no figure of speech; it is opposed to a communion with devils which is secured by attendance at meals following on sacrifice to pagan gods. The fellowship, too, penetrates into details of mutual consideration, even to the "waiting for one another" at the Supper. Not less clear are the heights to which the same fellowship, realised in the Eucharist, can ascend; S. Paul is prepared to give up all but Christ, it is scarcely too much to say, so that his brother may not be made to stumble.

Fellowship within the Brotherhood is a dominant trait of S. Clement's exhortations to the same Church. United in conscience, and joined in purpose, he would hear them sing in harmony from one mouth to God. The language is Eucharistic; the thought is Eucharistic, too; and the keynote is unity and concord,—in a word, fellowship.

So also in S. Ignatius' Epistles, the fact that one bread is broken is emphasised for the Church at Ephesus; the oneness of the Eucharist, for the Philadelphians, in that there is one Flesh of the Lord and one cup for unification in His Blood, and but one altar-shrine. The unity aimed at in ecclesiastical organisation culminates in the fellowship displayed in and ensured by the common Food.

The testimony of the Didache is seen in the beautiful figure of the ninth chapter: "As this broken loaf was sown broadcast upon the uplands, and gathered together into one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom." It is so obvious that universal concord demands local unity, that such a prayer must presuppose efforts at communal fellowship to hasten the glad time to which the prayer looks forward; and this fellowship is associated with the Eucharist.

[1] For an examination of the meaning of *κοινωνία*, see the article on "Communion" by Canon Robinson in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

[2] Cf. *Ecce Homo*, Chap. xv., where the *συσσίτιον* aspect of the Lord's Supper is eloquently and sympathetically brought out.

Outward fellowship rather than inward Communion is the main thought in these passages, and the same is true of Justin's language. The baptized convert is admitted into a Brotherhood, and his admission is sealed by a kiss of fellowship. This fellowship is maintained in the perpetual Memorial mutually preserved in the Eucharist, in the exercise of joint charity, in association against all evil and misfortune, and furthermore in unanimity of act and speech in the celebrations of the common Eucharist.

In S. Irenaeus' writing the inward Communion is asserted as a fundamental truth, universally acknowledged and of Apostolic tradition.

V

THE EUCHARIST AS A SERVICE OF THANKSGIVING

Thankfulness was the atmosphere in which the first Christians passed their lives, and the Letters of S. Paul are replete with manifestations of, and exhortations to, this characteristic disposition of the Christian soul. In no canonical Epistle of the Apostle to any one of his Churches does the verb *εὐχαριστεῖν* fail to appear at least once, except in that to the Galatians, which was written from the fulness of a heart distraught by the aberrations of a lovable but fickle set of men.

To begin, however, with the Gospels, in the many meals there described, at which JESUS presided, thanksgiving is interwoven with blessing (*εὐχαριστεῖν* | *εὐλογεῖν*). The act of thanksgiving is central also in the Last Meal; in every account of the Institution thanksgiving with blessing precedes the bestowal of the bread and cup.

In the Acts there are four mentions of the Breaking of Bread, and though in the first three there is no direct specification of an accompanying *εὐχαριστία*, we could hardly doubt that thanks were offered. On the last of these four occasions, S. Paul, in a moment of weariness and peril, "took bread, and gave thanks to God before all, and broke, and began to eat." It need not be assumed that this was a formal Eucharistic Service: no doubt many non-Christians shared the meal; but all the more irresistible is the inference that if at such a time and under such circumstances thanksgiving was not

omitted, its expression on the Lord's Day in Church before partaking of the Divine Gifts must have been considered essential. This is verified by the place assigned to thanksgiving in the Apostle's directions to the Corinthian Church. The offering of thanks must have formed a large and established part of the Service so that his regulations for its expression should be needed.

The passages from S. Clement's Epistle cited for their liturgical ring are the dedication of thanks and praise to God "through JESUS Christ, the High-priest and Guardian of our souls." Other passages offer thanks to Him for His power over flesh and spirit, for His fatherly care, for creation, preservation, and redemption, for civil peace and concord,—such is the trend of the great final prayer which brings the letter towards its close; and the grounds of thanksgiving are recalled earlier in these words: "Let us consider, brethren, of what matter we were made; who and what manner of beings we were, when we came into the world; from what a sepulchre and what darkness He that moulded and created us brought us into His world, having prepared His benefits aforehand ere ever we were born. Seeing therefore that we have all these things from Him, we ought in all things to give thanks to Him, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen."

It has been seen that the Service which S. Ignatius calls the Thanksgiving, Εὐχαριστία, is certainly the Lord's Supper in which the bread is broken. To those, who like himself used that name, which was destined to be so wide-spread and lasting, the giving of thanks was a primary aspect of the Service whose riches have led to a multiplication of titles[1]. In the West no less than in the East of the Asiatic peninsula thanksgiving had become by the opening of the second century so settled and prominent a feature of the Eucharist as to furnish its habitual name.

In the Didache, the first words, before receiving the cup and the bread, and after reception, are in all three cases words of thankfulness. For the cup: "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy Servant";
for the bread: "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for life and knowledge";
and afterwards for both: "We give thanks to Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy Name...and for knowledge and faith and immortality...Thou hast given

[1] The propriety of some of these titles is elucidated in an all too brief volume, *Titles and Aspects of the Holy Eucharist*, by Dr Talbot, Bishop of Rochester.

food and drink to mankind for refreshment so that they may give thanks to Thee, and Thou hast vouchsafed to us spiritual food and drink and life eternal...Above all we thank Thee that Thou art powerful." Thus thanks are given for physical as well as spiritual food; and in the purest strain of Christian gladness, God is thanked for His almighty power. It is noticeable that besides the ascription of everlasting glory there is recorded one prayer, and one only,—for the protection of the Church and its consummation in the Divine Kingdom.

Before the middle of the second century Justin Martyr speaks of the bread and cup of the Εὐχαριστία, and even of the food called Εὐχαριστία. The president is said in the course of the Service to make "for considerable time thanksgiving for our having been deemed worthy of these things from Him." The gift of earthly food and endowment of heavenly Grace are thus the immediate objects of thankful praise; but the creation, preservation, and redemption of mankind are not left without mention; for "at the same time we give thanks to God for His creation of the world with all that is in it for the sake of man, and also for His liberation of us from the evil in which we had come to be, and for the dissolution of principalities and authorities through Him who underwent suffering according to His will."

As has been already remarked, S. Irenaeus' writings would rarely make mention of truths and practices which were the common wealth of Church life except in so far as they enforced or illustrated his arguments against fractional or imperfect truth. Like his predecessor Justin he calls both Service and Food, Eucharist; and also explicitly asserts that the bread and cup of blessing are offered to God, whilst thanks are given to Him. The thankful offering of the firstfruits of the earth, which are summarised in the elements, implies that this thankfulness covers temporal as well as eternal Gifts, and so extends throughout the whole realm of human nature.

Thus may be seen with great clearness the universality of thanksgiving in celebrations of the primitive Eucharist, and the nature of the causes which evoked thankfulness. The name Eucharist has not been retained by the English Church in her Book of Common Prayer, and rightly, because it is not our rendering of thanks which is the heart of the Divine Service; of greater significance, to us at least, if it is permissible so to speak, is the participation in the eternal Gifts which make the Eucharist to be also the Lord's Supper and the Holy Communion.

VI

THE EUCHARIST AS A MEMORIAL SERVICE

The Memorial aspect of the Eucharist is not independent of the sacrificial aspect, for an Eucharistic sacrifice offered to God the Father in the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Son would necessarily recall and proclaim the ineffable Sacrifice of the Cross. As the nature of the Memorial is easier to apprehend than the kind of the Sacrifice, the consideration of the former fittingly precedes that of the latter.

A service, which is wholly or partially memorial, recalls some past event or person; and in this connexion the statement of S. Paul is the most precise possible. "As often as you eat this bread and drink the cup," he writes to the Corinthian Church in the earliest document which mentions the Lord's Supper, "you proclaim the Lord's Death, until He come." This is an Apostolic application of a precise command of the Lord's, reported by S. Paul just before. "Do this for My Memorial," was the Divine injunction imposed upon the Apostles immediately before their Master's Death and amid the clearest intimation of its imminence.

The inward or subjective side of the Memorial is therefore the remembrance of Christ's Death whereby alone is obtained remission of sins. The Death would naturally recall the Resurrection, the most joyful event in the history of the world; but primarily the remission of sins by "that His precious Death," must, if the words of Christ reported in the first two Gospels are borne in mind, be the chief recollection constituting this half of the memorial aspect of the Eucharist.

The outward or objective side of the Memorial is a proclamation of the Death of Christ before God and men, a perpetual commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross before the Father and the world. In Raphael's magnificently conceived and sublimely pathetic fresco, so unhappily named the Disputa, the Eucharistic bread is enthroned among representatives of human power and weakness, holiness and sinfulness, in the presence of God and the heavenly Company: and a memorial of the One Sacrifice is made by the uplifted hands of the Lord of Glory. It is indeed in this that the memorial

culminates; the broken bread and the outpoured cup proclaim more eloquently than words the Passion undergone by the Lord in His Body and in His Blood for the sins of the world.

Coming to S. Ignatius, we once more have before us the earnest eloquence of a Bishop eager for martyrdom to scrutinise in respect of the Memorial aspect. In withstanding the moral ruin which Docetic gnosis threatens to bring about even in these early days, Ignatius opposes to that baleful half-truth the integral fact that the Eucharist is "flesh of our Saviour JESUS Christ, which suffered on behalf of our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised." Thus the Eucharist proclaims to all, to Christian, Jew, and Pagan as well as to Gnostic, the redeeming Death of the Lord, and the Resurrection which was its crown.

There is not in the prayers of the Didache any verbal memorial of the Lord's Death, although the benefits reaped from His Life, of "knowledge, faith, and immortality," are thankfully recapitulated; the omission loses something of its strangeness if the forms are for individual use and not for public recitation. In the later recension, less local and more universal in its style, incorporated into the Apostolic Constitutions, the deficiency is abundantly remedied. The Suffering, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of the Lord are all commemorated in word as well as in act; thanks are given for the "precious Body" and the "precious Blood," for He "enjoined that we should proclaim His Death"; the gracious name Σωτήρ is introduced, a name not found in the Didache; and the memorial is made to include the Incarnation.

Yet, even if words of such direct import were not employed, wherever the Eucharistic Service was in any way associated with the Last Supper, it could not fail to recall that Supper, and the Tragedy it ushered in. It would recall and memorialise deliverance from sin as effectually as the Passover recalled and memorialised deliverance from bondage. The severe restraint sensible in the language of the Didache would force the reader, unless the whole were to remain an enigma, to use the Cross as the only key to its mystical words.

The two great writers of the second half of the era considered, Justin Martyr and S. Irenaeus, afford in this regard a curious analogy to their own positions in the history of the Church. The former dwells upon the memorial, the latter upon the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. To Justin's eyes,

God's general beneficence is declared in the giving of thanks "for all that we use for our sustenance." The day of the celebration recalls and proclaims continually the Resurrection, for "on that day JESUS Christ our Saviour arose from the dead." But these memorials are only ancillary to the supreme Memorial enjoined by the Lord's command. Justin is perfectly explicit: the bread of the Eucharist, he says, was ordained by Christ "to be offered for a memorial of the Passion which He underwent for men cleansed from all evil in their souls." Again, the consecrated bread was ordered by Christ to be offered "for a memorial of His Incarnation for those who believe on Him, for whose sakes He became subject to suffering," and the cup "for a memorial of His Blood," that is, of His Passion and Death. Lastly, in still more precise and concise manner, Justin states that the Eucharist is the food of Christians, "in which is commemorated the Passion which the Son of God underwent on their behalf."

In the passages of S. Irenaeus under examination, the memorial aspect is not emphasised, perhaps for reasons already specified. In the Latin version, and in that only, of a paragraph from the fifth book, the Eucharistic cup is said to contain the "outpoured" Blood of Christ[1].

The unique and direct command of the Lord, recorded by S. Paul and obeyed by the Church, so to make a continual memorial of Him, until memorials are lost in the brightness of the day of His coming, gives to this aspect of the Eucharist a very lofty importance. The foremost purpose of the Sacrament is the bestowal and reception of spiritual nourishment. At the same time a memorial is made of the Saviour's redeeming love. Thanksgiving and prayer are not wanting. Mystical communion with Christ and with His Church is secured.

Yet the terms "primary" and "secondary" are somewhat beggarly in their quantitative significance. All these aspects or efficacies of the Divine Service are capable of co-existence in their highest degrees without rivalry or interference or exclusion. To them may and must be added the sacrificial aspect. It will be seen that the only question is: "In what senses is 'sacrifice' to be understood?" This enquiry we will try to make shortly and clearly in the next section.

[1] In the second fragment published by Pfaff, *S. Irenàei Fragmenta Anecdota*, 1715 (Harvey, Fragm. 36), the Eucharistic offerings are said to be ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ Κυρίου: but Harnack has branded the fragment as a forgery, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. 5, Part 3, 1900.

VII

THE EUCHARIST AS THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE

Much has been written upon this solemn and precious aspect of the Mysteries entrusted to the Catholic Church; and, if at least a large part of this literature is in the present day more devotional than critical, the value of personal experience and perception is not to be belittled in comparison with the fruit of historical and critical research[1]. In the present investigation the field has narrow limits; the question is not the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist in and for itself, but the detection of the bearing upon it of a comparatively small number of passages which have been taken from the New Testament and early Christian writings.

The investigation, moreover, will confine itself to broad outlines, to phrases rather than to words. The sacrificial connotations of *ποιεῖν*, *ἀνάμνησις*, *αἷμα διαθήκης*, *καταγγέλλειν*, *θυσιαστήριον*, have been variously estimated and described by scholars, and are passed over here with the sole remark that whatever sacrificial tone they impart to Eucharistic language is positive evidence, however small, for seeing in the Last Supper and in the Eucharist an intimate connexion with a culmination of the sacrifices of the Old Testament, whether that culmination be in the Cross absolutely and exclusively, or shared by the Eucharistic offering.

To pass over the study of the words *ποιεῖν*, *ἀνάμνησις*, *αἷμα διαθήκης* is to reserve decision on the four accounts of the Institution in this respect, and a decision may obviously be better made when the mass of later evidence has been examined. It is helpful to scrutinise the Christian consciousness of a sacrifice in the Eucharist, in order on the firm basis of unambiguous primitive thought and feeling to effect a surer interpretation of the Scriptural language as it was understood by contemporaries of the writers and by the writers themselves. The magnificent promise of the Lord

[1] Of recent books the more noteworthy are Dr Mortimer's *Eucharistic Sacrifice* (1899) and the much more incisive work by Bp Gore, *The Body of Christ* (1900). A tract by G. H. Moberly (undated, W. W. Gardner, London) in the form of a dialogue discusses *Sacrifice in the Eucharist*. But none of these, nor any other work we have encountered, considers the first century and a half of Eucharistic doctrine and practice with any great degree of fulness in this regard.

did not lack fulfilment in any age: we trust it will not fail now or henceforward: "These words I have spoken to you in proverbs; an hour comes when I shall no longer speak to you in proverbs."

S. Paul opposes the Lord's Table to the devils' table, and as an intermediate term in his argument points to the sacrifices of the Old Testament: "Look at Israel after the flesh. Are not those who eat the sacrifices in fellowship with the altar? What then?... You cannot share a Lord's Table and a devils' table." At pagan tables as at Jewish the worshipper ate a share of the sacrifices, and so established communion with the beings to whom the sacrifices were offered. To some extent the Lord's Table is like both these sacrificial feasts; and so the Apostle's words might suggest that the Lord's Supper is "a feast upon a sacrifice[1]."

In the prosecution of historical research based upon the study of documents few things are more sure than that, throughout the second century, the Eucharist was thought to be or to contain a sacrifice, and not the memorial of a Sacrifice only. The fact is patent, though it has been overlooked by some students. The character and significance of the sacrifice may indeed give occasion for discussion; it may be difficult for many minds to secure conviction in this direction; but that the Eucharist was considered, during the second century and by the Church as a whole, to be a sacrifice, this is indisputable.

It has been seen that S. Clement institutes a comparison between the religious usages and ordinances of the Old and New Testaments; and this parallelism he applies to the conduct of a service of united thanksgiving which cannot be other than the Eucharist. The Letter is replete with quotations from the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and it is evident that the writer, representing the consensus of opinion in the Church of Rome, sees in the New Testament a continuous development into final perfection out of the Old. The spirit of his reminder recalls the declaration made by the canonical Writer to the Hebrews: "We, too, have an altar." The Eucharist is so akin to the sacrificial services which it replaces that

[1] If the two conceptions of Eucharistic efficacy: (i) the eating and drinking of the very Body and very Blood of Christ so as to secure the benefits of His Passion and Death, and (ii) the eating and drinking at the same table with the Lord, and so securing grace by the ensuing Communion with Him, —if these two views are put into a false antagonism with one another, the former is by the plain teaching of the four Gospels the true one.

the principles of the ordinances pertinent to them may be transferred to find their application in it. In some sense, then, S. Clement considers a sacrifice or sacrifices to be offered in the Eucharist.

The attitude of S. Clement towards the Old Testament may lead us to take up a question of significance from this point of view, the question whether the Last Supper was a Passover Meal or not. The chronology of the Synoptists diverges palpably from that of S. John's Gospel: the Jewish day beginning at evening, the former place the Supper on Nisan 15, but the latter assigns it to Nisan 14, twenty-four hours before the ordinary time for holding the paschal meal. A recent writer has re-considered the whole matter, and has arrived at the conclusion that the Last Supper was not eaten at the time of the paschal celebration[1]. In that case the sacramental core of the Supper may still have been enveloped by an anticipatory celebration of the Passover; but would not this indicate an unseemliness of haste in the consummation of the Lord's Passion[2]? It was more fitting that the Lord should die, the first of the paschal lambs which He superseded once and for ever. The Sacrament was not a continuation, revision or consummation of the Passover. The annual Passover was no more than a faint shadow of the sacred Meal which should perpetually recall the Sacrifice of the Cross in the past, implore afresh the Remission of Sins in the present, and secure augmented Spiritual Life for the future.

To return, the Epistles of S. Ignatius contain no clear allusion to Christian sacrifice, except through the repetition of the word *θυσιαστήριον* in the sense of a fold or Church: "he who is within the shrine is pure; he who is without the shrine is impure (in conscience)": "one shrine, as one bishop." The Church therefore is a *θυσιαστήριον*, the place in which *θυσίαι* are offered; and the sacrifices are apparently contained in, or associated with, the Eucharist.

The language of the fourteenth section of the Didache has been seen to be in strange contrast with the ninth and tenth sections; it bears the most direct testimony to the offering of a sacrifice in the Eucharist, whilst the others do not mention it. Preparation is necessary before attendance so that "the sacrifice be pure," and nothing must be allowed to "defile the sacrifice" of

[1] C. H. Turner, *Chronology*, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

[2] Nihil enim incomtum atque intempestivum apud Eum, quomodo nec incongruens est apud Patrem ...omnia quae praecognita erant a Patre, ordine et tempore et hora praecognita et apta perfecit Dominus noster: S. Irenaeus, III. xvi. 6, 7: part of the epilogue to Dr Hort's *Hulsean Lectures*.

the Church[1], for the Lord declared by His Prophet: "At every place and time I will have offered to Me a pure sacrifice." The election of presbyters and deacons is to help to secure this.

The last word upon sacrifice by the last prophet of the Old Covenant[2] was continually before the Church of the second century; the Apologist Justin and the Bishop Irenaeus quote it more than once, and with the same application as above. It may have been in the mind of S. Paul when using the phrase "the Lord's Table," of which Malachi speaks before, and immediately after, this announcement of the Lord's honour among Gentiles and the extension of His worship beyond Israel.

In debate with the Jew Trypho, Justin shows that the New Dispensation has its own peculiarly pure sacrifices. "The meal-offering," he urges "was a type of the bread of the Eucharist which the Lord JESUS Christ handed down to us to offer for a memorial of His Passion....Whence concerning the sacrifices offered by you God says through Malachi one of the twelve: 'My pleasure is not in you, saith the Lord, and I will not accept your sacrifices at your hands; for from the rising of the sun unto its setting My Name has been glorified among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to My Name and pure sacrifice.'" A little later Justin makes this point again, applying the same quotation from Malachi to "sacrifices through this Name, which JESUS the Christ ordained to be made, namely, in the thanksgiving (Eucharist) of the bread and cup, made by Christians in every place on earth." He then proceeds: "Until now you disputatiously assert that the sacrifices made in Jerusalem in the days of the Israelites, God does not accept, but that He said that the prayers made by the Dispersion were acceptable, and that He called their prayers sacrifices. Now I also say that prayers and thanksgivings, made by the worthy, are alone perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God. For these only did Christians receive that they should offer (in the Eucharist)."

A passage addressed to pagans shows a yet wider extension of the idea of the Christian sacrifices: "We are not atheists, for we worship the Maker of this world," who has no need of sacrifice, "praising Him for all we eat,... having been instructed that this honour alone is worthy of Him that we

[1] Compare S. Clement's allusion to the sacrifices of the Old Testament: *Μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν.*

[2] The LXX version of the declaration of Malachi (1[11b]) is: *Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα προσάγεται τῷ ὀνόματί Μου καὶ θυσία καθαρά.*

offer for ourselves and the needy, instead of destroying by fire what He made for sustenance."

In this way the Apologist insists before Jew and pagan that the Christian Church has sacrifices better than theirs: prayers and thanksgivings, along with the grateful and unselfish acceptance and use of the good things created by God, are the sacrifices of Christians, and most especially the thanksgiving of the bread and cup in the Eucharist. In writings addressed to unbelieving Jews and sceptical pagans much of the deeper and subtler parts of Christian truth cannot find a proper place; and it is to Irenaeus that we naturally turn for whatever light his defence of Catholic truth may shed. Gradually and painfully the Church begins to formulate her experience and conscience. Misrepresentation and hostility impose the task of analysing and describing the faith of the heart, and the adjustment of the relations between doctrine and practice. The devotional attitude must not shrink from the critical and the exegetical so that no soul may be lost from Christ through knowledge "falsely so called," and in order that the restless mind may find repose in the possession of a consistent and comprehensive basis for religious thought.

The testimony of Irenaeus is occasional and incidental, and so of extreme value. He is not writing on the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist nor dealing primarily with the Eucharist itself. The allusions to sacrifice are only parts of the theological system ingrafted in his mind, and accepted by those to whom he appeals against heresy. The sacramental theology beginning to formulate itself in his writings is sometimes impugned as a "late" "ecclesiastical" "accretion," in violent contrast with the plain, simple and direct teaching of Christ. Between the Sermon on the Mount and the arguments of S. Irenaeus on the Resurrection of the Flesh there is an immense gulf. But the comparison of the two defeats its own end if it endeavours to vilify the theology of Irenaeus because of its complexity and lateness: how could so great progress towards the fulness of the truth have been made,—in that slow, assured way in which the Holy Spirit is wont to work, with "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little,"—in less than a century and a half? And the results of a slowly grinding mill are thorough and lasting.

It is a merely specious and fallacious objection to Irenaeus' teaching which takes its stand on the advanced and recondite character of his

theology. The mysteries of God and of the Incarnation and even of our own spiritual life are unfathomable; yet Christ promised instruction in them "as we are able to bear it," and of no particular hour of any day of any year can it be said that His teaching by His Holy Spirit came utterly to an end. A jealous, suspicious or apathetic attitude towards this great saint, bishop and scholar, a man of world-wide travel, connected by a short personal chain with the Apostles, in particular, with S. John, is by all means to be avoided.

What then may be gathered from the passages taken from Irenaeus' work?—First of all, there is a general statement on sacrifice: "Sacrifices do not sanctify a man, but the conscience of him who offers, if it be pure." At the Last Supper, the Lord "instructed His Disciples to offer firstfruits of His creatures to God, not that He needs them, but that we should not be unprofitable or ungrateful." The latter part of this admonition is echoed elsewhere. Still more clearly, Christ taught at the Institution of the Eucharist "the new oblation of the New Covenant." This sacrifice in the Eucharist is pure, as God said by His prophet Malachi; and "the oblation of the Church, which the Lord instructed to be offered, is accounted a pure sacrifice before God and accepted by Him."

Thus, for Irenaeus, the Eucharist contains a sacrifice: and the nature of the sacrifice can be seen. Clearly there is an offering to express gratitude to God for the ordinary blessings of life; the "firstfruits of God's creatures" are summed up in the bread and wine[1], and these are a sacrifice to God as truly as Abel's: so that, however humbly and imperfectly, the Church shows herself not unprofitable and ungrateful.

The offering of "the firstfruits of those creatures which are His" is connected by Irenaeus with the sacrifices of the Old Testament. "There are sacrifices," he writes, "in the (Jewish) people and there are sacrifices in the Church; the kind is the same, save that the offering is now made by the free and not by the bond." That is to say, there is the oblation of a sacrifice in the Eucharist, cognate with the sacrifices of the Old Dispensation.

These gift-offerings God "wills to have made at His altar frequently

[1] Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, recapitulatio, the gathering-up into one head, seen in Christ as the representative of mankind (Dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem et omnia in Semetipsum recapitulans), is a most beautiful and most luminous Irenaean idea.

and unceasingly." The altar is in heaven, like the heavenly Temple and Tabernacle, for thither are the oblations directed.

On the whole, therefore, we do not see that S. Irenaeus, or any of his predecessors, teaches that the Eucharist is a sacrifice or oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ; nor that it is a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross. In the Eucharist is an oblation of God's natural gifts, with offerings of thanks and praise upon an heavenly altar: but the Divine Gifts are received, not offered.

VIII

THE ECONOMY OF THE EUCHARISTIC MYSTERY

In this section will be found little more than a summary of what has already been remarked in this place and that, but for completeness' sake and from the difficulty of the subject a restatement of the views of our authorities, more especially of Justin and Irenaeus, on the economy of the Eucharist will be entered upon.

The bread and wine blessed in the course of the Eucharist are the seat of a mystical process resulting in an enlargement of their efficacy. Before consecration they possessed the natural capacity for nourishing the physical man, in a mysterious manner from which physiological science has not removed the mystery: after consecration, they possess besides a supernatural capacity for nourishing the spiritual man, in a mysterious manner beyond the grasp of the mind.

Every account of the Institution of the Eucharist contains the Lord's plain and direct assertion of an ineffable fact. Of the bread which He has blessed He declares in language of astounding simplicity and immeasurable depth: THIS IS MY BODY; and of the cup, similarly: THIS IS MY BLOOD. The words following: DO THIS FOR MY REMEMBRANCE, have ever been taken to be a command with promise: that when the Church does these things, her Lord responds by His Holy Spirit, and effects the fulfilment of the ordinance by granting His very Body and Blood.

These then are facts. How far any theory can probe the Mystery is a question of relative insignificance. Theories may come, and theories may go: remains the eternal saving fact. To believe the Lord's promise really and truly fulfilled is surely sufficient. The necessity for a theory of the

economy of consecration can only arise out of conflict of the truth enunciated by the Lord with other truths of real or fancied equality in rank[1]. Thus there may indeed be need to ascertain whether the startling language of the Lord is startling because it conflicts with real or supposed truths. In the direct contradiction of two truths there is a stress, sometimes intolerable and often irksome. It is desirable to see whether such a contradiction or inconsistency is introduced into the mental world by the belief, that Eucharistic bread and wine are after consecration the Body and Blood of Christ, as it is found in the writings before us.

The age of such reflection had not fully arrived at the beginning of the second century. S. Ignatius is content to allude to the Lord's teaching, and shows no sign of wishfulness to go further and away from the realm of practical life and spiritual needs. He discourages the speculative bent, it may be understood, seeing how the gnostical element of human nature had led men astray. For him facts are sufficient. The tone of the Epistles suggests that the Saint rests upon spiritual experience. Those who allow reason to plunge them so far into scepticism as to cause them to refuse the Divine Food of the Eucharist do a wrong allied to sin. Going very little distance further, we may say that a man's inability to understand the mystery of physical life is little reason why he should not partake of bodily food; and the like is the more true of spiritual things. In the Eucharist is the pearl of great price: let us accept it thankfully, believing where we cannot understand.

Without essaying to interpret further the spirit which breathes in the Epistles of Ignatius, let us turn to Justin and Irenaeus, in whom begin to appear the fruits of careful enquiry and faithful contemplation, combined in the rhythm and balance of perfect truth.

Justin Martyr asserts the identity of the consecrated bread and cup with the Body and Blood of Christ; and he has enriched Christian thought by a magnificent statement of the economy of the Eucharist, which may be transcribed in short paraphrase, the better to display the parallelism:

As by word of God supernatural Christ assumed natural flesh and blood of man:

[1] All truth is Divine if not all equally precious; and no grain of truth can be spared from the treasure-house of God. Hooker wrote: "There is in the world no kind of knowledge whereby any part of truth is seen, but we justly account it precious."

so by word from Christ natural food assumes supernatural Body and Blood of Christ.

This analogy, addressed to the philosophical pagan, is an apology for the Eucharist. The Feast is no Thyestean banquet: it is a Divine mystery, proceeding from and illuminated by the eternal Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God. As God took to Himself manhood with its flesh and blood, even so by a converse process the bread and wine are glorified in the Sacrament ordained by Him.

The view of S. Irenaeus is strikingly like that of his forerunner: on this common topic the teachings of officer and private in the army of God are nearly identical. That the bread and cup are by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ is frequently stated as one of those established and incontrovertible truths which heretics must face. More than this is asserted, with complete confidence in the assent of the Church to the position laid down, in words closely like those of Justin:

The (physical) food, made Eucharist by prayer of word from Him,—is both Flesh and Blood of Christ.	Earthly bread receives the invocation of God and is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly.
JUSTIN.	IRENAEUS.

By prayer to God are added to the bread and wine the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Lord. Those who partake of them receive both natural and spiritual things together, the one refreshing the body no less than before, the other preserving the soul to eternal life.

TANTUM ERGO SACRAMENTUM
VENEREMUR CERNUI:
ET ANTIQUUM DOCUMENTUM
NOVO CEDAT RITUI:
PRAESTET FIDES SUPPLEMENTUM
SENSUUM DEFECTUI.

Copt Codd	Pesh Codd	All other Greek Codices and Versions	Dadff^{2}il
		14 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ.	
		15 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν.	
*		16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.	
*	*	17 καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς·	
*	*	18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.	
		19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου	
		τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.	*
		[III] καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.	*
		21 πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ κτέ	
* Omit *vv.* 16—18.	* Omit *vv.* 17—18.	So also Marcion (in Tertullian).	* Omit *vv.* 19 *b*, 20.

b (+e)	Syr^{cur}	Syr^{sin}
Dico enim vobis..... in regno Dei.	...ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.	...ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
Et accepto pane, gratias egit, et fregit, et dedit illis, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum.	καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.	καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
Et accepto calice, gratias egit, et dixit: Accipite hoc et dividite inter vos.	καὶ δεξάμενος τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας, εἶπεν· Λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς·	καὶ ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι δεξάμενος τὸ ποτήριον, εὐχαριστήσας, εἶπεν· Λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη.
Dico enim vobis, quod non bibam de generatione hac vitis hujus, donec regnum Dei veniat.	λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ μὴ πίω...Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ μὴ πίω...Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.
Verumtamen ecce etc.		
Variations of e from b unimportant.		

ADDITIONAL NOTES

A. NOTE ON THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER

Considerable labour would not be misspent in settling the text of the canonical accounts of the Institution. No question of any moment seems to arise, however, except in the Lucan text, where, in the passage Lc 22^{14-20}, the verses 19*b*, 20 are absent in the Western text. The words *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον...τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* are enclosed in double brackets in the Westcott-Hort text, to indicate that they are assigned to the class of readings styled "Western non-interpolations." On the other hand, the full text is read by Tischendorf, Jülicher and Spitta[1]. The textual evidence is reproduced in schematic form from materials furnished by Dr Sanday in his Article "Jesus Christ" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

Dr Hort considered that "the difficulty of the shorter reading consists exclusively in the change of order as to the Bread and Cup" (*Notes on Select Readings*, p. 64); whereas in the longer reading there is the greater difficulty in that it "divides the institution of the Cup into two parts, between which the institution of the Bread is interposed." He concluded that "these difficulties, added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Co 11^{24-25} and the transcriptional evidence..., leave no moral doubt... that the words in question were absent from the original text of Lc."

The shorter reading would seem, however, to present other difficulties besides the change of order. Comparison of the shorter reading with the Marcan and Pauline parallels suggests that in the middle of the measured and solemn language of the Evangelist an hiatus has arisen. The words: "This is My Body," are made to precede immediately the abrupt announcement: "But, lo! the hand of My Betrayer...," and the symmetry and balance of the narrative are lost in a manner which the accompanying arrangement of the longer reading may serve to suggest:

14 And when the hour came,
He reclined,
and the Apostles with Him.

---

15 And He said to them: With longing I longed to eat this Passover with you before My suffering.

16 For I declare to you that I eat it no more until it is consummated in the kingdom of God.

17 And receiving a cup He gave thanks and said: Take this and divide it among yourselves.

18 For I declare to you that I drink not henceforward of the produce of the vine until the kingdom of God come.

---

[1] As Hoffmann states: *Die Abendmahlsgedanken JESU Christi*, Königsberg, 1896, p. 21.

19 And taking a cake, He gave thanks and broke it and gave to them, saying:
This is My Body, *which is being given on your behalf; do this for My memorial.*

20 *And the cup, similarly, after supper, saying:*
This cup is the new Testament in My Blood, which is being shed on your behalf.

---

21 But, lo! the hand of My betrayer is with Me on the table.

It is difficult to identify the cup of verse 17 with the Eucharistic cup of Mt-Mc; and it would be natural to have the renunciation of meat and drink followed by the bestowal of the new Meat and the new Drink. Further, the divergence of the shorter reading from the Pauline account (1 Co 11^{23-25}) would be a surprising phenomenon, more surprising than such a resemblance as the longer reading would present. Why indeed should a writer[1], "the follower of Paul," who "put down in a book the Gospel preached by that Apostle," at a date considerably subsequent to the Apostolic letter, effect a radical diversion from it?

Either the Evangelist would leave out the account, or insert it in words similar to those used by his Apostolic companion[2]. Thus Dr Hort would appear not to have estimated sufficiently highly the difficulties of the shorter reading.

Nor again is Dr Hort's objection to the longer reading so weighty as to turn the scale against it. It is based on the supposition that the cup of the Lord's Blood receives double mention, although there is no need to assume this; and there is supposed to be involved "a startling displacement of the only command to drink or receive recorded by Lc in connection with a cup." Even if much more be conceded than seems necessary, this attitude would seem unduly to neglect the powerful word ὡσαύτως, which gains additional point from the parallelism already described. Nor does the displacement of the statement, λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω κτέ, relative to Mt-Mc, possess any special significance, if it be understood to be an emphatic assertion of the finality of the Last Supper; and, lastly, there is no need to see in verses 17—18 "an anticipatory reference to the Institution of the Cup" as recorded in verse 20.

The position here taken against Dr Hort may appear more acceptable in view of the theory of the textual variations which follows.

There is a very great and strong consensus of codices against the Bezan omission, and if a reasonable hypothesis can be framed to account for the pathological variations, the vastly greater MS evidence for the longer reading may be followed with confidence. The verse and a half at stake (19*b*, 20) are mainly identical but not

[1] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III. i. 1: Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο.

[2] Cf. F. Blass, *The Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, pp. 179—182, where the same decision is adopted, in the light of his view of the history of the text of the Gospel.

entirely coincident with 1 Co $11^{24, 25}$, and the divergences are sufficient to discountenance the view that the Evangelist is copying from a manuscript of the Epistle. There are, in the brief passage: words added, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, διδόμενον, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον: words displaced, μου, ὡσαύτως: words omitted, ἐστίν, and the whole phrase, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν: words changed, μου for ἐμῷ. Thus, in respect of 37 words in the Epistle, the Gospel displays change amounting to 20 words. Does not this suggest the independent evidence of two writers who had investigated the matter together, rather than the work of a copyist? In a question of history it might even be that the Missionary Apostle would be influenced by the Historian who had industriously traced traditions to their sources.

Against the presence of the longer reading in the earliest copies of the Gospel may be set the evidence of the Latin versions *b*, *e* and the Syriacs, Cur and Sin. It seems impossible to derive them from the full text without violence. Hardly less difficult is the mutilation of Dd, etc., if the longer reading is primitive. The other curtailed texts, Codd Copt Pesh, present little difficulty: the original account might seem to the translator to contain too much, and this might lead to the omission of verses 16—18 and 17—18 respectively, the justification for such a procedure being found in the accounts presented by the first two Gospels.

The theory of two autographs, employed by Blass, Salmon and others, to elucidate the general characteristics of the Western Text, is helpful in this particular instance. So exceptional a problem as that of the Western readings requires an exceptional hypothesis for its solution[1]; and "the purely documentary phenomena are compatible with the supposition that the Western and non-Western texts started respectively from a first and a second edition of the Gospels, both conceivably apostolic." Such is the view of Drs Hort and Westcott. We may postulate two editions from S. Luke's hand, the first addressed to Theophilus only, but having such a wide circulation (so Blass suggests) as to be issued in a second edition from the hand of the Evangelist with a view to its use in the service of the Church. If the first omitted verses 19, 20, and the second supplied them, and the two editions existed side by side for some while, the phenomena of the text are then easily accounted for as follows.

From the shorter edition are made the Latin and Syriac versions: *b*, *e*; $\text{Syr}^{\text{cur, sin}}$. They are intended for use in Church, and contain no clear account of the Institution. This account needs to be supplied, and is filled in from other documents. The Latin translators note the mention of a cup in verse 17, over which thanks are given, and which the Disciples receive from the Lord. Comparing the verse with Mt 26^{29} or Mc 14^{25}, they assume the cup of verse 17 to be the Eucharistic cup, and fill in the lacuna by incorporating the greater part of Mt 26^{26} or Mc 14^{22} so as to introduce

[1] Westcott and Hort, *New Testament in Greek*, Vol. ii. § 241.

the Eucharistic bread. The Syriac versions are made by scholars acquainted with the Pauline Epistle as well as the first two Gospels, and the omission is therefore remedied in a more thorough manner. As Dr Sanday remarks, the Curetonian version advances on *b*, *e*. The words uttered over the Eucharistic bread are supplemented from 1 Co 11^{24}; but the cup is left untouched. Still another advance is marked by the Sinaitic version: the changes there made are more thorough, both in the adoption of ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι from 1 Co, and in the insertion of τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου, (ἡ) καινὴ διαθήκη; and the addition of διδόμενον is noteworthy.

There now remains the presumed mutilation in the Western Text, a text full of surprises[1], manifesting "a perilous confusion between transcription and reproduction, and even between the preservation of a record and its supposed improvement," in which "whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness." Such editorial arbitrariness might well defy scientific analysis; yet it is not hard to see at least one way in which an editor, having before him only Mt or Mc, and the two editions of the third Gospel, Lc^1 and Lc^2, might apply the art of harmonisation so as to settle to his own satisfaction a standard text from the two diverging Lucan texts.

There is in the longer reading of Lc^2 a seeming tautology, by which it has been supposed that the translators of Codd Pesh Copt were influenced. From another point of view the shorter reading of Lc^1 suffers from poverty, as the translators of Codd Lat Syr observed. The middle path would be found by adding to the reading of Lc^1 the verse 19*a* from Lc^2, or by the equivalent process of cutting off from Lc^2 the verses 19*b*, 20. This editorial revision introduces the Eucharistic bread, and a fair parallelism with Mt-Mc is ensured, without any great variation from either Lucan text, whilst the seeming double mention of the Eucharistic cup is done away.

In this way the complicated various readings become compatible with the assumption that the longer reading in the account of the Institution was written by S. Luke, though not in the first draft of his Gospel intended for private circulation. It remains to re-direct attention to the mass of documentary evidence for the longer reading; moreover, Marcion, as quoted by Tertullian, with all his proneness to excision, held to the full text in this passage.

[1] Westcott and Hort, *op. cit.*, §§ 170, 173.

B. NOTE ON DR GARDNER'S "ORIGIN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER"

Dr Gardner's tract (1893) is an application of the methods of "modern historical science" which have been explained and applied in the more general investigation of Christian origins in his *Exploratio Evangelica* (1899)[1]. The scale of the treatise is not quite so large as that of the tract, and in both the most important features of the evidence are summarised in a review of audacious rapidity. So little of detail is there, and so universal is the mere indication of revolutionary conclusions, that Dr Gardner's lack of leisure to effect a more patient and systematic survey must seem deplorable to every reader of his brilliant sketches.

First and last, the treatment of history is too subjective and psychological to engage acquiescence from any one who does not estimate human attitudes and human tendencies and human weaknesses in quite the same way as the author. What seems superficial or dogmatic may be due to the circumstances of writing, yet in his advocacy of "historical science" Dr Gardner displays a curious mixture of scientific reserve and unreasonable confidence. His dicta have been already quoted, that "there is this difference between the progress of physical and the progress of historical science: that in the case of physical science men usually grow towards an agreement, but in the case of historical research they do not necessarily do so," and that "it is certainly not true that a careful and erudite study of the origins of Christianity will bring all men alike into harmonious views." This is painful pessimism, and worse; from the advocate of "historical science" it is high-treason. We cannot be content with an historical method, which thus falls—

> Like a god self-slain
> On his own shrine lain.

But indeed Dr Gardner's words are in danger of applying only too well to his own work in early Christian history, for his lucid and masterful pages are crammed with high speculations and "broad views" in entire contrast with that patient and laborious coordination of evidence by which any sound scientific enquirer hopes to win nearer to objective truth. To be sure, such coordination needs to be directed and stimulated by provisional hypotheses, but hypotheses supported by an arbitrary miscellany of sporadic facts are worse than none.

In detail, Dr Gardner's tract will be looked through in the light of the retrenchments and corrections made half-a-dozen years later in Chap. XXXVI. of the *Exploratio Evangelica*. The subject of the origin of the Lord's Supper is stated to be "one of great interest, and distinctly one to be handled with all reserve and reverence,"—that is

[1] *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, Percy Gardner, Litt.D., Macmillan, 1893: *Exploratio Evangelica*, Percy Gardner, Litt.D., A. & C. Black, 1899, especially Chapters 36, 26.

to say, it may be presumed, no novel suppositions are to be rashly ventured upon, and the evidence is to be viewed with impartial thoroughness. The sources of information employed are the four canonical Gospels, to the authorship of none of which does Dr Gardner commit himself; and the first Epistle to the Corinthians, about the authorship of which he has no feeling of doubt. Now the words of S. Paul in describing the Last Supper "so closely correspond to those used in all the Synoptic Gospels that there can be no doubt that the version in the Epistle and those in the Gospels come from the same source." This is a surprising statement to one who has the four Accounts before him, yet, proceeds the author, "this is indeed the view commonly accepted by critics." Who the critics are, and what their arguments, the reader is left to recollect and imagine, if he can. Arguments for the opposite view have been developed at full length by Dr Hoffmann[1]; and these establish the reasonable view that objective fact was the common source.

Two of Dr Hoffmann's arguments against the views that "all the versions may be taken from some primitive tradition or record" and the alternative that "the phrases in the Gospels are taken from S. Paul's Epistle," which are urged by Dr Gardner, may be here mentioned, although in part they will be already familiar. First, there is the complete omission in Mc-Mt of the command, so significant in Dr Gardner's eyes, to "do this for My remembrance." Secondly, there is the transference of the redemptive efficacy of the Body in Pl to the Blood in Mc-Mt. Again, the peculiar time-mark of the cup, "after the supper," is dropped, and the forcible word ὡσαύτως is left out. Other minor divergences complete the case against Mc-Mt being derived from Pl, or even the two from a source other than the objective Supper itself. Dr Hoffmann's discussion of Lc need not be adduced.

Dr Gardner has an inkling of the precarious ground on which he thus takes his stand: if the hypothesis of Mc and Mt deriving from Pl is "too bold," he is willing to suggest as an easier hypothesis the historicity of Mc-Mt and of Pl, with the proviso that S. Paul has interpolated the command to repeat the order of the Supper, and that Lc has followed him. This autocratic procedure of the Apostle of the Gentiles Dr Gardner in 1893 ascribed to the fascinating influence of the Eleusinian Mysteries, exerted during S. Paul's residence for more than a year at Corinth. Dr Cheetham[2] has vigorously attacked this grotesque view; nowhere, he says, do we "find anything described (in the Mysteries) in the smallest degree resembling the Breaking of the Bread and the Blessing of the Cup." In 1899, however, Dr Gardner withdrew explicitly from the view that S. Paul, "with all his catholicity, would accept a hint derived from such

[1] *Die Abendmahlsgedanken JESU Christi*, R. A. Hoffmann, 1896: see especially p. 42.

[2] *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian* (Hulsean Lectures), Macmillan, 1897: especially the Fourth Lecture.

a source." For such a withdrawal no occasion need have arisen if from the first the Apostle's words on the relation of the Lord's Table to the demons' tables had been weighed; to S. Paul compromise could not be possible:

> Whoso hath felt the Spirit of the Highest
> Cannot confound nor doubt Him nor deny:
> Yea with one voice, O world, tho' thou deniest,
> Stand thou on that side, for on this am I.

S. Paul's acquaintance with the Mysteries is indicated, though Dr Gardner does not find occasion to draw attention to the fact, in the second chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians:

Καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον...Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις... ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ, τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην. But if S. Paul had originated celebrations of the Lord's Supper he might have grafted them upon the Christian agapae without emulating the pagan feasts.

From S. Paul's use of the preposition *ἀπό* in his statement that he "received from the Lord what he handed on" to the Corinthians, Dr Gardner infers a direct revelation like those claimed elsewhere by the Apostle; for instance, *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως* ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ. Even in the fifteen days spent at Jerusalem in S. Peter's society the historian does not find it possible to allow that S. Paul occupied himself with acquiring information about the human life of the Lord from either S. Peter or S. James, or that S. Paul's knowledge was derived from external sources principally. The Apostle of the Gentiles is pourtrayed as the subject of vague visions and unspeakable ecstasies, a dreamer of dreams, with a great deal to learn from old and new schools of history about the "sacredness of fact." A dark fog is conjured up: in those days "Apocryphal Gospels sprang like mushrooms from a rich soil"—about A.D. 55; and so Dr Gardner "cannot be surprised that the Apostle did not stop to consider seriously whether his statement went beyond his evidence," as he "localized the vision in history." S. Paul's mind was not historical in its attitude, it is urged; scarcely an "ancient writer regards history as a course of events to be established by evidence and document."

Surely Dr Gardner is mistaken. A close companion of the Apostle's directly anticipates any such attack upon his trustworthiness:

"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed." The Historian who wrote this gives an account of the Institution which runs parallel to S. Paul's.

And Dr Gardner does yet graver injustice to S. Paul. He transforms the indefatigable Missionary, travelling to and fro over the Roman Empire, meeting and conversing with all sorts and conditions of men, into a sufferer from religious mania, a victim of hallucinations, a subject to questionable impulses. It is true that the Apostle claimed to have seen the Lord; and thus, as he "draws no line of distinction between the appearances of the risen Lord to the other Apostles and to himself," remarks Dr Gardner, it would be easy for his mind to fix in history as objective and universal what was subjective and individual. But did he so do without warrant?

The fourth Gospel is next considered, and the method of historical criticism applied to it. The Evangelist is thought "to have rejected the (Pauline) version of the Last Supper," not that he altogether omits it, but that he reproduces the Lord's words in quite a different context. "He brings in," so it is maintained, "the very phrases cited by S. Paul, in quite another connexion." The English equivalents of two incompletely quoted sayings of the Lord from Jn 6 are adduced for proof:

Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν [ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς]
and Ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον [κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ].

But are these "the very phrases cited by S. Paul"? The language of Dr Gardner is perfectly bewildering. There is indeed a connexion between Jn 6 and 1 Co 10, 11, yet the interval is as great and the difference as obvious as between the seed and the plant. An examination of Jn 6 fuller than is essayed by the author of *The Origin of the Lord's Supper* has displayed a religious development of which the seeds are visible at that stage, and of which the fruits appear in the universal habit of the communities forming the Church of the Apostolic age.

Dr Gardner passes outside the New Testament to the Didache, "an early Christian work of great value," showing "a very noteworthy independence of the Pauline teaching and influence." Its value for his argument is that it attests the view that, where Pauline influence was absent, the Eucharistic feast remained undeveloped, a mere social meal. The best answer to this is the detailed discussion of the Eucharistic sections of the Didache, which has been already undertaken. In his incidental way, Dr Gardner seizes upon fragments of S. Paul's Epistle and the Didache, which occur in each writing close to mention of the bread and the cup; they are

1 Co 11^{26}	Did 9^4
Ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε [, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ].	*Ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἕν, οὕτω συναχθήτω Σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν Σὴν βασιλείαν.*

The one passage is the statement by S. Paul of a certain consequence of reception

of the Body and Blood of the Lord: the other is a prayer associated with the reception of the broken bread in the Eucharist. The one is a piece of Eucharistic doctrine, and the other a piece of Eucharistic prayer. "What could present a greater contrast?" enquires Dr Gardner. Whatever contrast there may be, the prayer of the Didache could certainly be conceived not out of place at a "Pauline" celebration. The idea of the Church as a unity to be consummated is not at all foreign to S. Paul's teaching. It seems needless to say more, except that the Didache makes thanksgiving a central feature of the Eucharist, whilst S. Paul, in face of disorderly proceedings, is bound to emphasize special features of the Service.

The relationship of the agapae with their eucharistic aspects to the Eucharist proper (Lord's Supper) is shortly noticed by the writer. He welcomes only tepidly the wretched hypothesis of "friction between S. Paul and the Apostles at Jerusalem" in the matter of the Lord's Supper. More helpful are his views on the analogy between the pagan and Christian mysteries. "What more natural," he asks, than that "the sacred meal wherein pagans found communion with their devil-gods, should be paralleled by a Christian sacred meal, wherein the believers should have communion with their exalted Head?"—Dr Gardner seems to us to be here pointing to one of those universal longings and aspirations of man which the Son of Man came to answer and fulfil and exalt. In Him we should indeed have expected to find lasting and complete provision for spiritual appetites, which He knew to be in man because they were implanted by Him. If S. Paul could be reasonably supposed to have realised acutely this active hungering of the human soul, how much more would not his Lord be aware of it, and how is it unlikely that on the last night of His earthly sojourn, after long preparation, He should then and there provide that in the Church founded upon His Apostles there should be a never-failing means of satisfying these deep spiritual yearnings common to humanity? That the Lord did so, S. Paul said he heard from the Lord Himself.

C. NOTE ON MR WRIGHT'S VIEW OF S. JOHN VI

The very plain and direct interpretation of Jn 6 adopted in this Essay is opposite to a view advocated by Mr Arthur Wright almost as an *obiter dictum* in the preface to his *Synopsis of the Gospels*[1].

Mr Wright goes further than to find in Jn 6 the institution of a sacrament: he considers that its eucharistic language would have been "absolutely without meaning, if the Eucharist had not been already in common use." The recognition of the

[1] *A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, Arthur Wright, Macmillan, 1896: compare also Mr Wright's examination of Dr Gardner's tract in Chap. xiii of his: *Some New Testament Problems*, Methuen, 1898.

Lord at supper by the two disciples at Emmaus is adduced in support of the position; the breaking of the bread is assumed to be "the Eucharist," and, as "the rite would have had no significance for them," because they were not present at the Last Supper, therefore the Eucharist, for this reason also, must have been instituted earlier, say, at the first Passover at Jerusalem. S. Mark fell into the error of "blending two Suppers into one," namely, the first Passover and the last Supper, for "it is clear from S. John that the Last Supper was not the Paschal feast." And confirmation is discovered in S. Paul's calling Christ "our Passover."

Mr Wright's view needs weighty proof, for it must be considered a canon of rational criticism that no authority shall be assumed to have fallen into error without a reasonable amount of direct evidence to that effect.

In the first place S. Luke is not explicitly mentioned by Mr Wright. If the longer reading be adopted, for reasons given in Appendix A, there is to hand an account independent of the Marcan tradition, and corroborating its assignment of the occasion of the Institution to the eve of Christ's death. The agreement of two separate streams of tradition upon a point against which there is absolutely no direct evidence,—S. John's silence being explicable on another hypothesis than Mr Wright's—cannot be lightly neglected. Further, S. Paul cannot be quoted against himself, for he expressly asserts that he received from the Lord that the Sacrament was instituted on the night of the betrayal.

There is a contradiction between the Synoptic and Johannine Gospels as regards the date of the betrayal, and it may be understood that the latter corrects an error in the primitive Synoptic tradition. The Last Supper was most probably not paschal; but whether it was paschal, anticipatory of the passover, or not paschal, matters little to the present argument. It is sufficient to observe that every canonical Account intertwines the Institution with the Betrayal: all alike are mistaken if Mr Wright is not.

A double difficulty arises in the way of accepting Mr Wright's conclusions about the supper at Emmaus. In the first place, the taking, blessing, breaking, bestowing of the bread, do not stamp the meal as an "Eucharist," unless the feedings of the multitudes were Eucharists, for in them the same ritual was observed,—and this seems to be directly contrary to the Lord's words: the food they received was *βρῶσις ἡ ἀπολλυμένη*: He bade them strive rather after the *βρῶσις ἡ μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, which He would give them some time in the future. To understand in a perfectly satisfactory manner the incident at Emmaus no more is needed than the recorded use of characteristic words and gestures by the Lord whenever He presided at table.

That the language of Jn 6 would be quite unintelligible if the Eucharist had not been instituted some time before, is a matter of opinion. Many of the disciples are

reported to have found in their Lord's words an invincible stumbling-block: the words were hard to understand and harder still to believe. To the outer circle of hearers, debating how He could give them His Flesh to eat, it was an amazing paradox. To the inmost circle even, Christ had occasion to say: "Will you also go away?"—Thus the very unintelligibleness of the teaching proves that the Eucharist was not yet instituted. Had the Eucharist been already instituted, all would have been comparatively clear. Had the Lord identified bread and wine with His Flesh and Blood, the most simple-minded would have seen how He could give them His Flesh to eat, although they might not sound all the depths of the Divine Mystery. Instead of this, many of His disciples "went backward and walked no more with Him."

On these grounds, apart from considerations of a more positive character, Mr Wright's view cannot claim acceptance. The old view is preferable still, that the Vital Discourse is general and theoretical and promissory, and the Lord's Supper specific and practical and secured. The one is the preparation of the soil, the other the tree of life planted therein.

D. NOTE ON THE AGAPE

Except for a doubtful reference in the second Epistle of S. Peter the agape is mentioned but once in the New Testament: S. Jude speaks of "reefs in your agapae, feasting with you," in allusion, evidently, to the abuse of a social meal. There is nothing apparent by which it may be further characterised, either here or in the only other explicit reference[1] before 180 A.D.

The doubtful reference may be shortly dismissed. If reference there be, nothing more is contributed to the little that is deducible from S. Jude's words. The reading ἀγάπαις is supported only by B and the Versions; and it seems most probable that the editor of the Epistle, having that of S. Jude before him, substituted for ἀγάπαις the colourless word ἀπάταις because he did not care to allude specifically to the love-feasts. The close resemblance to the earlier Epistle led doubtless to the correction of ἀπάταις to ἀγάπαις in the later, and again, in some codices, to the correction of ἀγάπαις to ἀπάταις in the earlier: or the variations may be accidental.

The abuses deplored by S. Jude in such vigorous terms were the seeds of decay in the agape. It was an outward sign of Christian love, which had its prototype not in the Last Supper but in the Feedings of the Multitudes.

[1] In one of the Epistles of Ignatius: see above, pp. 61, 63. The Letter of Pliny may afford some slight grounds for surmise. It seems unprofitable to speculate on such a meagre basis of fact. There is considerable material beyond A.D. 180, and this has been examined by Dr Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharist*, 1901.

E. NOTE ON THE EUCHARISTIC SECTIONS OF THE DIDACHE

The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth paragraphs of the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* run as follows[1]. Noteworthy additions to, and divergences from, the Didache are printed in spaced type, and redactions or quotations are printed in thick type:

Ap Co vii 25 Γίνεσθε δὲ πάντοτε εὐχάριστοι, ὡς πιστοὶ καὶ εὐγνώμονες δοῦλοι· περὶ μὲν τῆς Εὐχαριστίας οὕτω λέγοντες· **Εὐχαριστοῦμέν Σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ Παιδός Σου, δι' οὗ καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησας καὶ τῶν ὅλων προνοεῖς, ὃν καὶ ἀπέστειλας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπον, ὃν καὶ συνεχώρησας παθεῖν καὶ ἀποθανεῖν, ὃν καὶ ἀναστήσας εὐδόκησας δοξάσαι καὶ ἐκάθισας ἐκ δεξιῶν Σου, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐπηγγείλω ἡμῖν τὴν ἀνάστασιν τῶν νεκρῶν. Σύ, Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, Θεὲ αἰώνιε, ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο διεσκορπισμένον καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο εἷς ἄρτος, οὕτω συνάγαγέ Σου τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς Σὴν Βασιλείαν.** Ἔτι εὐχαριστοῦμεν, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τιμίου Αἵματος ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐκχυθέντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ τιμίου Σώματος, οὗ καὶ ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα ἐπιτελοῦμεν, Αὐτοῦ διαταξαμένου ἡμῖν καταγγέλλειν τὸν Αὐτοῦ θάνατον· δι' Αὐτοῦ γάρ **Σοι** (ἡ δύναμις) **καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν. Μηδεὶς δὲ ἐσθιέτω ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀμυήτων, ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ βεβαπτισμένοι εἰς τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατον.** Εἰ δέ τις ἀμύητος κρύψας ἑαυτὸν μεταλάβῃ, κρίμα αἰώνιον φάγεται, ὅτι μὴ ὢν τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως μετέλαβεν ὧν οὐ θέμις, εἰς τιμωρίαν ἑαυτοῦ· εἰ δέ τις κατὰ ἄγνοιαν μεταλάβοι, τοῦτον τάχιον στοιχειώσαντες μυήσατε, ὅπως μὴ καταφρονητὴς ἐξέλθοι.

26 **Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν Σοι, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός Σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἔδωκας ἡμῖν διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ Παιδός Σου. Σύ, Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ὅλων, ἔκτισας τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ δι' Αὐτοῦ, καὶ νόμον κατεφύτευσας ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὰ πρὸς μετάληψιν προευτρέπισας ἀνθρώποις· ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀμέμπτων πατέρων ἡμῶν, Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, τῶν πιστῶν δούλων Σου· ὁ δυνατὸς Θεός, ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἀψευδὴς ἐν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις· ὁ ἀποστείλας ἐπὶ γῆς ΙΗΣΟΥΝ τὸν Χριστόν Σου ἀνθρώποις συναναστραφῆναι ὡς ἄνθρωπον, Θεὸν ὄντα Λόγον καὶ ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὴν πλάνην πρόρριζον ἀνελεῖν· Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν δι' Αὐτοῦ μνήσθητι τῆς ἁγίας Σου Ἐκκλησίας ταύτης, ἣν περιεποιήσω τῷ τιμίῳ Αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ Σου, καὶ ῥῦσαι Αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελείωσον Αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ Σου καὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ Σου, καὶ συνάγαγε πάντας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Σὴν Βασιλείαν, ἣν ἡτοίμασας Αὐτῇ. Μαρὰν ἀθά· ὡσαννὰ τῷ Υἱῷ Δαβίδ, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, Θεὸς**

[1] Adapted from *The Teaching of the Apostles*, J. Rendel Harris, 1887, pp. 30—31.

Κύριος ὁ ἐπιφανεὶς ἡμῖν ἐν σαρκί· Εἴ τις ἅγιος, προσερχέσθω· εἰ δέ τις οὐκ ἔστι, γινέσθω διὰ μετανοίας. Ἐπιτρέπετε δὲ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ὑμῶν εὐχαριστεῖν.

The Eucharistic prayers of the Didache are reprinted below with Johannine references following the words or phrases illustrated: Εὐχαριστοῦμέν Σοι (Apoc 11^{17}), Πάτερ (Ev. *passim*) ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου (Ev 15^{1}) Δαυεὶδ (Apoc 22^{16}) τοῦ παιδός Σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας (Ev 15^{15}, 17^{26}) ἡμῖν διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ Παιδός (*non Joh*) Σου· Σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Apoc 1^{6}, 5^{13}).

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν Σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς (Ev 3^{16}, $6^{27, 35, 47}$, 10^{10}, 17^{3}, Apoc 21^{6}, 1 Ep 1^{2}, *et passim*) καὶ γνώσεως,...Ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα (Ev $6^{12, 13}$) διεσκορπισμένον (Ev 11^{52}) ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἕν (Ev $17^{21, 23}$), οὕτω συναχθήτω (Ev 11^{52}) Σου ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν Σὴν Βασιλείαν· ὅτι Σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις (Apoc 4^{11}, 5^{12}, 19^{1}) διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (*add* τῶν αἰώνων, Apoc *passim*).

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν Σοι, Πάτερ ἅγιε (Ev 17^{11}), ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου Ὀνόματός Σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας (Ev 1^{14}, Apoc 21^{3}) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας (*non Joh*), ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ τοῦ Παιδός Σου·...Σύ, Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ (Apoc 11^{17}, *cit supra*), ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα (Apoc 4^{11}) ἕνεκεν τοῦ Ὀνόματός Σου, τροφὴν (*semel*) τε καὶ ποτὸν (*non Joh*) ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν (*non Joh*) ἵνα Σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον (*plus q vicies*) διὰ τοῦ Παιδός Σου· πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν Σοι ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ Σύ·...Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Σου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι Αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ (Ev 17^{15}: *cf Orat Dom*) καὶ τελειῶσαι (Ev 17^{23}, 1 Ep 4^{18}, *et al*) Αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ (Ev 13, *et seq*) Σου, καὶ σύναξον Αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν (Ev $17^{17, 19}$, Apoc 22^{11}) εἰς τὴν Σὴν Βασιλείαν, ἣν ἡτοίμασας (Ev $14^{2, 3}$, Apoc 21^{2}) Αὐτῇ·... Ἐλθέτω χάρις (Ev $1^{14, 16, 17}$ *et al*) καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος (1 Ep 2^{17}). Ὡσαννὰ τῷ Θεῷ Δαυείδ. Εἴ τις ἅγιός (Apoc 22^{11} *et passim*) ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω (Apoc 22^{17})· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω. Μαρὰν ἀθά (*Apoc* 22^{20}). Ἀμήν.

It is hoped that these materials may prove useful in the further examination of the Eucharistic witness of the Didache. It has already been mentioned that the Didache seems never to quote from the third Gospel where that differs from the first, and its quotations from the common matter of the Gospels according to SS. Matthew and Luke are, with a single exception, closer to the former than to the latter. There can be little doubt that the first Gospel was familiar to the compilers of the Didache, and of the Synoptists probably that alone. It would be interesting to find further traces of the influence of the first Gospel otherwise than in the way of direct quotation.

INDEX

I. *Personal*

(The References are to pages)

Aquinas 113

Blass 56, 117, 118
Brightman (59), 68

Cheetham 121

Dante 81

Gardner vii, ix, 41, 45, 120—124
Garrad ix
Gore 105

Harmer x, 89
Harnack vii, (33), 64, 66, (73), 74, 75, 104
Harris 64, 127
Harvey x, 83, 104
Hoffmann vii, ix, 116, 121
Hooker 92, 112
Hort x, (2), 53, 107, 116—119

Jülicher vii, 116

Keating viii, 126
Keble 85
Knowling 55

Lightfoot x, 59, 62, 63, 64, 89

Moberly 105
Mortimer 105
Myers (122)

Otto x

Parsons ix
Pfaff 104
Plummer ix, 60
Plumptre 81

Ramsay 63
Raphael 102
Robinson ix, 98

Sabatier iii
Salmon 70, 118
Sanday ix, 65, 116—119
Schäfer vii
Schaff 65, 70
Seeley 98
Spitta vii, 45, 116
Srawley ix
Staley 65
Swete viii, (32), (51), 78, (106)

Talbot 100
Tischendorf (55), (108), 116
Turner ix, 107

Westcott x, 116—119
Wright 124—126

Zahn vii, 64

II. *Verbal*

(The references are to lines of the Textual Materials)

ἀγάπη 144, (147), 356, (366)
ἀδελφοί 149, 155, 214, 291, 475, 484
Αἷμα 37, 38, 41, 42, 56, 77, 101, 112 (=199), 167, 205, 248, 333, 338, 342, (398), (426), 510, 519, 607, 680, 743, 751, 777, 779, 780, 785, 788, 794, 803, 813, 823
αἷμα 245, 507, 509, 782, 795
ἀνάμνησις 99, 109 (=196), 113 (=200), 516, (526), 567, 604, 607, 641, 644
ἀνάστασις 39, 350, 375, 559, 596, 650, 763, 825
ἀπαρχαί 674, 684, 708, 736
ἀπόστολοι (4, 10, 45, 53, 65, 68), 87, 125, 512, (519), 534, 561, 674, 683
ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν 58, (349), 501, (613), 788

βάπτισμα 123, 158, 356, (391), 414, 473, 477, 501

δεῖπνον 100, 110 (=197), 185, 186
διαθήκη 57, 77, 101, 111 (=198), 681, 685
διάκονος 329, 344, 494, 546

ἐκκλησία 188, 223, 352, 409, 430, 682, 701, 835, 838
ἕνωσις (148), 170, (267), 342, (361), (527)
ἐπίκλησις (508), 757, (798), (821)
ἐπίσκοπος 328, 343, 351, 353, 355
εὐλογεῖν 2, 47, 52, 72, 115, 166, 218, 378, 529
εὐλογία 166
εὐχαριστεῖν 8, 14, 44, 55, 75, 93, 96, 106 (=194), 140, 221, 222, 231, 292, 399, 400, 404, 416, 417, 425, 428, 439, 441, 458, 492, 495, 508, 515, 518, 544, 571, 608, 678, 742
εὐχαριστία 220, 236, 322, 340, 346, 347, 353, 399, 413, 453, 487, 489, 499, 542, 567, 589, 590, 622, 638, 657, 739, 754, 759, 762, 780, 799, 822, 830, 836
εὐχή (*προσευχή*) 127, 235, 236, 346, 453, (463), 476, 489, 539, 540, 541, 636, 637, 638, 657, 766

ἡμέρα 55, 84, 127, 132, (279), 359, 440, 531, 554, 596, 597

θυσία 65, 85, 172, 174, 175, 253, 256, 295, 443 445, 447, (451), 578, 581, 584, 588, 617, 619, 620, 627, 633, 637, 640, 660, 665, 669, 689, 693, 699, 703, 705, 715, 716, 719, 720, 721, 727, 731
θυσιαστήριον 173, 242, 299, 319, 326, 327, 343, 765, 766

ἰδιώτης 219, (289)
ἱερεύς (*ἀρχιερεύς*) 246, 287, 288, 300, 314, 379, 614, 619, 626, 646

καθαρός 326, 327, 329, 396, 442, 448, 565, 568, 585, 617, 694, 699, 702, 722, 727, 735, 738
κλάσις (*ἄρτου*) 3, 45, 52, 73, 96, 107 (=194), 115, 119, 126, 128, 133, 137, 141, 168, 323, 404, 408, 440, 781, (798)
κοινωνία (42), 126, 167, 168, 172, 176, 255, 756, 780, 781, 834
κρᾶσις (*ποτηρίου*) 398, (484), (496), (523), (541), 776, 797

μάννα 17, 28, (160), (426), (642)
μεταβολή 461, 509
μωμοσκοπεῖν 299

ὁμοίως 8, 121, 517, 541, 589, 679

παράδοσις : παράληψις 104 (=191), 105 (=192), 455, 503, 514, 521, 566, 571, 603, 621
περί 57, 245, 296
πνεῦμα 159, 160, 161, 218, 228, 229, 307, 376, 380, 470, 486, 530, 757, 808, 809
ποιεῖν 98, 108 (=196), 112 (=199), 516, 570, 604, 608, 641
πρεσβύτερος 328, 344, 828
προεστώς 483, 493, 536, 541, 549
προσφορά (*προσφέρειν*) 252, 277, 284, 295, 298, 299, 447, 458, (487), (542), 564, 566, 578, 584, 588, 618, 675, 682, 683, 693, 698, 699, 701, 702, 705, 708, 714, 715, 718, 721, 726, 733, 737, 738, 752, 755, 764, 767
προφήτης 438

Σάρξ 33, 36, 38, 40, 42, 332, 337, 341, 347, 510, 807
σάρξ 172, 307, 506, 509, 748, 756, 783, 800, 802, 809, 811
συνείδησις 292, 330, 720, 734
Σῶμα 54, 74, 97, 108 (=195), 169, 170, 205, 209, (395), 426, 517, 679, 742, 750, 775, 782, 795, 799, 803, 806, 814, 822
σῶμα 246, 375, 761, 796, 823

τράπεζα 103, 178, 179
τύπος 163, 566, 594

ὕμνοι 62, 82, 229, 459
ὑπόστασις 784, 801

ψυχή 124, 310, 375, 569

ὡσαύτως 99, 109 (=196), 679

III. *Topical*

(The references are to pages)

Agape 51, 61, 63, 86, 94, 124, 126
Alms 54, 72, 91
'Apostolic Constitutions' 68—69, 103, 127—128
Art 86, 102

Baptism 72, 92, 95, 96, 99
Breaking of Bread 55, 66, etc

Celebration 46—47, 56, 71—72, 86
Church 37, 49—50, 107
Cup of Mixed Wine 64, 73, 78, etc

Divergences in Evidence 43, 47, 125
Dogma 61, 75, 79, 109

'Enshrined' 51, 70
Eucharist 30, 53, 55, 67, 73, 75, 79, etc.
Evolution vi, 30, 40—41, 45—46, 56, 69, 83, 109
Excommunication 53, 92

'Feast upon a Sacrifice' 106
Fellowship of Christians 97—99, etc

Historical Method 1—2, 35, 40—41, 43, 45—46, 86, 120
Homily 59, 72, 91
Human Nature 77, 124
Hymns 85, 88

Incarnation viii, 2, 48, 74, etc
Institution 43—44, 46—47, 85—86, etc
Invocation 78, 80, 91

Kiss 52, 71, 91

Lection 72, 90
'Lights' 54, 85
Liturgy 52, 59, 63, 69, 87—90, etc

Manna 53, 96
Memorial 75, 79, etc
Ministry 52, 58, 60—61, 69, 72, 90—91, 93—94, etc

Oblation of Firstfruits 80, 101, 110

Pagan Mysteries 85, 121—122, 124
Passover 103, 107, 125, etc
Pauline Revelation 31, 43, 122
Postulates 2, 45—46
'Prophets' 67, 68, 88, 90

'Recapitulation' 110, etc
'Reservation' 91
Resurrection of Flesh 78, 97
Ritual 48

Sacramentalism 48, 54, 74, 81, 97, 109
Sacrifice 76, 81, 111, etc
'Sacrificial Language' 32, 35, 42, 105
'Spiritual' 49, 53, 54, etc
Sunday 51, 66, 74, 84

Testaments, Old and New 32, 34, 35, 58, 75, 76, 77, 80, 93, 96, 106, 108
Titles of Eucharist 53, 100—101
'Transubstantiation' 32, 73, 74, 79, 81, 111—113
'Truth' 2, 112

Vital Discourse (Jn 6) 49—50, 124—126

Western Text 118

IV. *Evidential*

(The Textual Materials are summarised)

I. New Testament

Mt 14^{19-20}, 15^{36-37}, 26^{26-30}
Mc 6^{41-42}, 8^{6-9}, 14^{12-26}
Lc 9^{16-17}, 22^{7-21}, 24^{30-35}
Jn 6^{11-56}, 21^{13}
Ac 2^{41-47}, 20^{7-11}, 27^{35-36}
1 Co 5^{11-13}, 10^{1-24}, 11^{20-34}, 14^{16-19}
Eph 5^{18-21}
Col 4^{2-3}
He 13^{8-16}
2 Pe 2^{13}
Ju^{12}
Apoc 21^{22}

II. Sub-Apostolic Writings

Clem Rom 34, 40, 41, 64
Ign Eph 5, 13, 20, Trall 7, 8, Rom 7, Philad 4, Smyrn 6, 8
Pliny Ep 96
Mart Pol 14
Epit Avirc
Did 9, 10, 14

III. Justin and Irenaeus

Just Apol $1^{13,\ 65-67}$, Tryph$^{41,\ 70,\ 116,\ 117}$
Iren c Haer IV xvii 4—5, xviii 1—4, xxxiii 2, V ii 1—3
Eus HE 5^{24}

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

KX-694-146